SIGILL. SCHOLAE RELIGIONIS PACIFICAE
COND. A.D. 1866
PRO
VERITATE
ET
REGNO
DEI
CHARLES HOLBROOK LIBRARY
Pacific School of Religion
BHC

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/prophetscult00unse

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

PROPHETS AND CULT

by

FRIEDRICH SEIFERT

LIBRARY

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Department of Old Testament Literature
and Interpretation
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Theology
in the
Pacific School of Religion

May, 1956

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

BS
1199
P7
S45
1959

PROPHETS AND CULT

by

FRIEDRICH SEIFERT

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Department of Old Testament Literature
and Interpretation
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Theology
in the
Pacific School of Religion

May, 1959

1st copy

62018

BS
1199
P7
S45
1959

~~DN~~
~~Se42 P~~

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

PART ONE: CONSTITUENTS OF ISRAEL'S FAITH 7

Chapter

I. CANAANITE RELIGION 8
- The Cult
- Names and Cult Terms of Canaanite Derivation
- Ancestor Worship
- El
- Baal
- Asherh/Anath
- Yahwe
- Moloch/Melech
- Zion
- Canaanite Feasts
- The Casuistic Law

II. THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS 50
- The God(s) of the Fathers
- The Difference Between the God(s) of the Fathers and the Deities of Canaan
- Passover and the Apodictic Law
- The Location of the Father Traditions
- The Covenant

PART TWO: THE BEGINNING OF ISRAEL'S EXISTENCE, THE COVENANT 70

- The Covenant in the Mari Letters
- The Terms of the Covenant: _Berith_, _Zedekah_, _Hesed_
- The _Torah_ of the Covenant
- Shechem and the Covenant
- Covenantal Corporate Solidarity
- Israel is the Property of Yahwe
- _Bachar_ and _Berith_ _'Olam_
- The New Covenant

PART THREE: THE THREE MAIN FORMING FORCES IN ISRAEL'S PRE-EXILIC LIFE 107

Chapter

I. THE LEVITES 108
- The Levitical Priesthood
- The Levites are Chosen by Yahwe
- The Levites and the Holy War
- The Ark
- The Tent of Meeting
- The Ark as the Cultic Center of the Tribes
- The Cultic Functions of the Levites

II. THE MONARCHY 148
- The Beginning of the Monarchy in Israel: The Charismatic King
- The Royal Traditions of Jerusalem
- Titles and Roles of the Jerusalem King: Priest, Anointed, *Ebed*, Righteous, Chosen, Son, God
- The Covenant Between Yahwe and David
- The King is the Corporate Whole
- The New Years and Enthronement Festival
- The Kingship of Yahwe and the Kingship in Jerusalem

III. THE PROPHETS 215
- Extra-biblical Evidence for the Existence of Prophets
- The Beginning of Prophetism in Israel: The Seer
- *Nebiim*: Office or *Charisma*?
- The Cultic Functions of the *Nebiim*
- The Criticism of the "Great" Prophets Against the "False" Prophets
- The Legitimation of the *Nabi*
- Prophet and Tradition
- The Prophetic Interpretation of History
- Prophet and Kingship
- The Attitude of the Prophets Toward Jerusalem
- Yahwe is King and Messiah
- Prophetic Criticism

PART FOUR: THE DEUTERONOMIC SYNTHESIS 344

The Origin of Deuteronomy and the Levites
Deuteronomy and the Holy War
The Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Prophets
The Deuteronomic Version of the Covenant
The Deuteronomic Law
The Deuteronomistic view of Kingship and the Josianic Reform
Deuteronomy and the Temple in Jerusalem
The Deuteronomic Condemnation of all Syncretism

PART FIVE: THE NEW HOPE: DEUTERO-ISAIAH. 394

Chapters 40-55
The Ebed Songs in Deutero-Isaiah
The Identity of the Servant

CONCLUSION ; 470

BIBLIOGRAPHY 485

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to show the intricate struggle in pre-exilic Israel between farmer and nomad, between the desire for security and an unprotected existence, between cult and faith. Cult is here understood as the means by which man attempts to exercise authority over his god by virtue of rites, rituals, and secret formulas. Cult is understood as the human limitation of God and something which tries to channel the power of the deity into human categories, which proclaims the "beyond-worldliness" of God without the consequences, because this "beyond-worldliness" is used to increase the power of the cult instead of preaching the sole authority of God. In other words, a cultic deity is without power; it is a creation of man and is therefore nothing.

Cult is the place where man assures himself of the service of the perhaps terrifying powers of nature; it is the place in which man confines that which troubles and frightens him. The gods are confined to their cult place, and man's encounter with them is regulated through the cult. Thus the fear is removed, and the gods are in reality servants of men.

Faith, or unprotected existence, is not interested

in nature because it knows that man is the lord of nature. The powers of nature can be symbols insofar as they bear the possibility of an encounter with God, but God himself is not one of those powers, for they are his tools. The nomadic faith such as we see in the fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, seems to manifest a god or gods whose characteristics are in complete contrast to those of the cult deities. We do not know much of Yahwe until we find that he was worshipped in the amphictyonic sanctuaries in Israel. However, we can try to find out about the gods of the fathers because they lived the same life as the nomadic elements which invaded Canaan to form a covenant among themselves through their common worship of Yahwe.

The "faith" of the Canaanites became a strong contender for the worship of the tribes. The sociological change from nomad to farmer left a wide field of the daily life open to the cult deities of the Canaanites, because Yahwe did not seem to be responsible for the agricultural conditions of the new life. Here we see the two elements _in nuce_ which all through their history, from the invasion to the exile, contended for the souls of the Israelites. As we have mentioned, the covenantal bonds with Yahwe established, for the nomadic elements which invaded Canaan, the amphictyony of what we call tribes, thus pushing them into the limelight of history. Therefore, the covenant may be

called the beginning of Israel's existence.

We shall pursue the struggle between faith and cult through five or six centuries of Israel's autonomous history. Three major forces are at work to form the life of Israel: the Levitical priesthood, the monarchy, and the prophets. The Levitical priesthood reaches back into the time before the monarchy, possibly into the time before the invasion. The Levites are the champions of a militant faith; they are the fighters for Yahwism in Israel, as reflected in their violent opposition to the installation of bull worship. When the Israelites adopted the institution of the monarchy from the surrounding nations, the Levites also opposed it strongly. The monarchy abandoned old amphictyonic customs like the holy war, and with it the leadership of the Ark in those wars. Jerusalem became the central sanctuary, the Ark was placed in it, and the sanctuaries in the country lost their importance to a great extent. Together with the establishment of Jerusalem as the central shrine, we find the rise of the Zadokite priesthood, which became the royal priesthood at the royal shrine. The Zadokites were not Levites. As opposed to the Zadokites, the Levites preserved the old traditions and taught the covenantal torah.

Together with the rise of the monarchy we discover the appearance of the phenomenon of the prophets. Were they a charismatic branch of Levites? What triggered their

appearance? The prophets cannot be treated with a common denominator; they have many things in common, but there is great variety where the form and content of their messages is concerned. Some of them stand in opposition to the monarchy, some of them stand in the service of the monarchy. Some of them live in orders, some of them have strong individual characteristics. Some of them oppose the cult as being a great hypocrisy. They proclaim the sovereignty of Yahwe, who is the real king. The king in Jerusalem or at Samaria is only his vicegerent, completely dependent upon the gifts of Yahwe. If they approved of the monarchy at all, the prophets favored the charismatic monarchy as represented in the beginning by Saul and later on by some prophet-designated kings of the northern kingdom. The prophets were the interpreters of history, which they considered Yahwe's main field of action. Because of the apostasy of Israel they proclaimed doom upon the nation, and some of them saw no hope for Israel at all. They lived in bitter dispute with the prophets of salvation who based their message upon the salvatory assurances of the cult.

After the end of the northern kingdom we find a flow of old tradition from the north to the south. The Levites of the country are responsible for the authorship of Deuteronomy. It was the purpose of Deuteronomy to renew the old traditions and to revive the early days of Yahwism.

In the original Deuteronomy the king is understood in the terms of the north, and is nothing but a functionary of the divine decree. The holy war was inaugurated again, thus restoring to the Levites the old importance they once held in the covenantal militia. Deuteronomy also combined the old covenantal concepts with the royal *bachar*-traditions of Jerusalem. This combination seemed to be the last chance for Israel, which had broken the old covenant. In addition, Deuteronomy accepted the prophets in its program, giving them a place in the new order of Israel's life.

Finally, after the downfall of the southern kingdom in 587 B.C., we find in Deutero-Isaiah an attempt at a complete synthesis of the Levitical traditions of the north, the prophetical traditions, and the royal traditions of Jerusalem, thus establishing a new hope and setting forth the ideas which were to govern the minds of the post-exilic Israel.

The struggle between cult and faith had come to an end. The cult had lost. Israel's faith after the exile was an uncultic faith. But faith did not win completely. The eschatological hope which speaks out of Deutero-Isaiah is a result of the royal cult in Jerusalem, historized, of course, but still a cultic scheme. It did not make the fulfillment of the hope dependent upon the exact execution of rites and rituals, but upon the exact fulfillment of the law.

PART ONE

CONSTITUENTS OF ISRAEL'S FAITH

CHAPTER I

CANAANITE RELIGION

CHAPTER I

CANAANITE RELIGION

The Cult

The justification for discussing some of the Canaanite gods and cultic patterns comes out of the Old Testament itself. Cult in its original form is a drama, as Mowinckel has declared.[1] This cult drama manifests itself in sacred rituals and dances, which are accompanied by sacred songs. In some cults the subject of these songs and the object of the cult may be a totem animal. The tribe has a close relationship to its totem animal. Welfare and fortune of the tribe depend upon the totem animal, which is believed to be the incarnation of the arch father of the tribe. This arch father established the sacred rites, orders, and regulations by virtue of which the life of the tribe is continued. The drama of the cult repeats or re-enacts the life of the arch father and thus his presence with the tribe is assured, as well as his strength and luck. Through the

---

[1] Sigmund Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II (Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1922), p. 26.

drama the strength of the totem animal is increased. The stronger the totem animal is, the stronger is the tribe and the more luck it has in its struggle for existence. The future of the tribe depends upon how well this cult drama is "played".

Mowinckel gives examples for the cult drama from other areas of the world. In ancient Greece, for example, the cult of Dionysus presents itself in a very dramatic form. Perhaps nowhere is it more manifest how much a god lives in his cult (and one has to conclude in his cult only) than in the case of Dionysus. The cult myth which maintains that all this happened once a long time ago is a reflection of the annual dramatic presentation in the cult. Dionysus is born, dies, and is resurrected annually. The participants in the cult experience what the drama presents in all reality; they participate in the wild hunt of Dionysus filled with orgiastic-ecstatic powers.[1] In Assur and Babylon the cult drama represents the combat between Marduk or Assur against the chaos dragon, Tiamat. After the victory over Tiamat, the great celebration of the enthronement of Marduk as the king over gods and the world takes place.

The cult creates the realities without which life cannot be lived. For instance, through the relationship

---

[1] See Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 29; also Gunkel and Zscharnack (eds.), Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928-1930), II, Sp. 1467, and IV, Sp. 329.

between tribe and totem animal the luck of hunting is secured for the Indians. Enough buffalos means enough to eat, which again is the basis of life. Through the achievement of unity with Dionysus men assume divinity themselves, and thus flee the law of mortality. The victory of Marduk over Tiamat means that order governs the lives of men and that the chaotic powers of nature are chained. The death and resurrection of Baal and Tammuz mean that after the drought of the summer,rain and fertility will reign again and thus make life possible.

The cult is a drama. This does not mean that the events depicted in the cult are merely "stage" events. For ancient men this drama becomes a reality; the drama enacted in the cult actually takes place. The daily lives of the worshippers are influenced by the cultic events and are dependent upon them. The cult creates strength for the worshipper and the god who is worshipped. In the cult the essence of men and the essence of god are comprehended as one. The essence of man and of his god is understood as being seized and seizing.[1] In the cult the Gestalt of god is believed, and the Gestalt of man is formed, and the Gestalt of their mutual relationship is actively experienced.[2]

---

[1] G. van der Leeuw, Phänomenologie der Religion (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956), p. 509.

[2] Ibid., p. 510.

The HOLY must become event in space and time; it must become audible and perceivable. Every event can be an event of the holy as much as every meal can be a sacrament. In other words, every action in human life can have symbolic value. It carries within itself the possibility of becoming an event of the HOLY. Van der Leeuw says that the symbol never is something unimportant, but rather a meeting (συμβάλλειν) of possibility and the given, of event and happening, of God and man. "The symbol is the participation of the Holy in its actual Gestalt."[1] We accept this very subtle interpretation of the cult.

We have to emphasize, however, that the Old Testament does not know the distinction between profane and holy in pre-monarchical period; we will see that for the time of the monarchy and for the prophets we have to assume this distinction. A meal is not an event of the HOLY, but the sacrament is. But if one eats, knowing that this meal is automatically a sacrament, the original symbolic meaning of the sacrament is lost. The symbol is the meeting of possibility and of the given. The given is the meal and the possibility is that this meal is not just a meal but an encounter of god and man. When the meal is taken for granted as a sacrament, the possibility is lost because the encounter is said to happen just because this meal is declared a cultic meal, a

---

[1] Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 510.

sacrament. In other words, when man sees his encounter with God in the cultic essence of the sacrament, then the meal is not a symbol any longer, but is a magic trick through which the encounter of man and God is manipulated. The possibility that this meal may not be a sacrament is out of the question, since the cultic significance of the meal assures its sacramental and therefore its symbolic character.

Through the cult God is "cut down to size". The cult does not know that God is too great for his own house, that he is too great also to be minimized into an energy which is communicated to men in small "doses". In the Old Testament we frequently meet an instinctive irrational fear of God.[1] The center of the religious experience is terror, something which is alien to the world, something which cannot be comprehended and captured; God is someone who comes and goes, committing himself to the fathers, but never being dependent upon them. He is not worshipped at any particular place because men do not know where he lives. Because of this there can be no talk of confining him to any place. The encounters cannot be regulated by any cult.

It has always been the purpose of the cult to seize the power and strength of the worshipped deity and make it "useful" to the needs and welfare of the worshippers. It has always been the purpose of the cult to secure communication

---

[1] See Exodus 23:27; Isaiah 8:13; 6. The names "pachad of Isaac" and "abir of Jacob" also indicate this.

between worshippers and deity and to provide the forms necessary to establish a successful communication. The fertility cult wants to secure fertility every year. In the words of the myth, the cult wants to assure itself of the grace and the strength of Baal, who is the giver of the desired fertility. Through the cult the existential realities of life become divine beings. Through the cult not only the holy strength but also the gods are kept alive - in the minds of the worshippers. Through myth the realities created in the cult are projected back into the beginning of time. What happens in the cult has already happened previously. The creation of the cosmos was the first cultic act.[1] Every cultic celebration of the creation meant a renewal of life through the creative power of the god.

Primitive man lived in a feeling of unity with his clan, tribe, or people. Through the cult this unity was involved in the natural orders of the world which it understood as the creation of a god. There was no tension between the inside of the clan or tribal unity and the world, the outside; the sacred orders which were celebrated in the cult governed all realms of life, inside and outside.[2] An uninterrupted chain of rituals and sacred customs secured the order of life and regulated the relationship to the god.

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 24.

[2] Gerhard von Rad, Theologie des Alten Testaments (München: Christian Kaiser, 1957), p. 46.

The cult revealed to man the hidden essence of his being and of his life. Through the cult the basic conditions of the life of the community were renewed; through the community, those of the individual were met.[1] Men were enclosed in the cycle of life which the cult celebrated. Deities and nature were enclosed in this cycle together with men.

Each event can be considered from two sides: from the side of its expression, which is the outside of the event, and from the side of its impression, which is the inside of the event. Every event has an expression; every event has something to say, to communicate. Not every event has an impression, however, for that necessitates its becoming an experience. Modern historical analysis, for example, seldom asks for the impression of an event; it does not consider this its task, but merely tries to recount an event, as if this could be possible. Usually it is the expression which comes to the attention of historians, which means that he receives the interpretation of the event and only that. The event itself remains hidden and has no life in itself.

The protest of the prophets did not attack the worship and service of Yahwe in itself, but the cult, insofar as the cult darkened the sovereignty of Yahwe, and insofar as it blocked the immediate confrontation of man with Yahwe.

---

[1] Rafael Gyllenberg, Interpretationes ad vetus Testamentum Pertinentes Sigmundo Mowinckel (Oslo: Fabritius & Sønner, 1955), p. 76.

The prophets' real attack was against the nature and fertility cults which provided men with religious satisfaction. The prophets denied that the cult had any relationship to Yahwe. Yahwe did not demand rituals, but faithfulness and love. The prophets denied also that Yahwe was living in the cult; they pointed to the realm where Yahwe was living and had always lived: in the political events.

The events of history were understood by the prophets as being the actions of Yahwe, thus they demanded that Israel must understand them as such. They tried to enforce the meeting of the given and the possibility, except that for them the possibility was not a possibility, for they were certain that Yahwe was acting. The "given" was the political-historical situation, and the possibility was that Yahwe was "in" this situation, so that this situation became a symbol for his will with Israel. To use our other analogon: the expression of the situation was clear, it was the threat to Israel's existence. The question was whether Israel understood, and whether it had gotten the impression that it was Yahwe who was blazing in anger against it.

It is the uniqueness of Israel compared with other nations in history that its faith in Yahwe as being different from the gods of the country was stronger than the powers of assimilation at work within it. Yahwe had never been captured in the cult because he did not fit into any of the cultic patterns. Because Yahwe was a stranger among all the gods

with which the Israelites had contact, Israel was a stranger among all the nations. There was, however, one period in Israel's history when its particularity was severely threatened. The inception of the monarchy had been an assimilation of the customs of the surrounding nations. The development of the monarchy, especially in its Jerusalemite form, meant that for reasons of state, Israel was opened to the cultures and ways of life of other peoples. How Israel could survive this threat we shall see later.

The Israelites of course did not think of Yahwe as the god of history. But they, or certain influential groups among them, acted as if they knew this concept. Openness to historical events is not something which belongs to any cult, because it means meeting the unexpected and receiving it as an action of God. Yahwe remained mobile as he had always been. He was the same type of god which the fathers had experienced and whom they should only name with a word which denoted the way in which he had met them.

Names and Cult Terms of Canaanite Derivation

In the most unexpected places we find terminology which reminds us of Canaanite fertility cult practices or we even find the Canaanite gods mentioned. Especially in the prophetic books - as we shall see later - we frequently find vigorous attacks upon practices in popular Israelite religion which actually are fertility cult ceremonials or related to them. A comprehensive report of what popular religion in Israel was like is found in Judges 2:6ff. We discover here the intrusion of common oriental cyclical thinking into a historical conception of the world.

Again and again we find ideas and thoughts which are at home in the cult-mythological world of fertility religion. To have a good relationship to the forces of nature, growth, rain, and fruitfulness has always been of primary importance to an agricultural society. We find that life derives its order from the dying of nature during the summer and the rising of fertility with the rain in the fall. Representatives for the different forces of nature are various gods and goddesses, which are responsible for drought and rain, plenty and want. The Israelite year also seems to have adopted the Canaanite order of the year with all its festivals and rituals which were necessary to provide fertility and growth to land, man, and animal.

Thus it is understandable that, together with the cult practices, many cult terms which are original to Canaan have been adopted by the Israelites. For instance, we do not know what the language of the Israelites was before they entered the country; the language which we know as Hebrew is the result of a mixture of languages which took place in Canaan. Law, scripture, and art were adopted by the Israelites from the more culturally advanced Canaanites. As Widengren has pointed out,[1] the word for temple, hekal, is a Canaanite word (hekalu in Ras Shamra), and was originally a loanword from the Mesopotamian ekallum. The word for the Ark, ארון, is a Canaanite word related to the Phoenician ארן, and is a loanword from the Akkadian aranu.[2] The name which designates the cult place, bamah, appears in the texts at Ras Shamra. Many cult places were inherited from the Canaanites.[3]

---

[1] Geo. Widengren, Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und im Judentum (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1955), p. 8, ftnt. 16.

[2] See also זבח which means (to) sacrifice, which is common to Hebrew, Phoenician, Ethiopic, Sabaean, Arabic, and Assyrian. See George Buchanan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 181.

[3] Those sanctuaries which are connected with the traditions of the fathers certainly are old Canaanite cult places, which are known through their deities: El Bethel (Genesis 31:13; 35:7), El 'olam of Beersheba (Genesis 21:33) ; see Albrecht Alt, Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel (2 vols.; München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953), I, p. 50. Other pre-Israelite shrines are Mamre in the south in the vicinity of Hebron and Shechem (see Martin Noth, Geschichte Israels (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954), pp. 92 and 115). Frequently the "high places" (במות) of the Canaanites

There has been an attempt made to derive the name "Israel" from Canaanite roots.[1] The Old Testament itself offers some explanation for the name "Israel". The aetiological legend in Genesis 32:23-33 tries "to launch a definite interpretation of the import of the word, perhaps in order to oust some other more original meaning."[2] However, we should not expect a linguistic explanation in Genesis 32. The text explains the name "Israel" as meaning "wrestler with god". It seems to derive the first part of the name from the verb שרה, which means according to the context "to battle" or "to wrestle". Literally translated the name then would mean "El battles", or "he battles with El".[3]

Another legend connected with the sanctuary at Bethel offers another version of the event when Jacob's name was changed into "Israel". This time, however, it is clear who names Jacob Israel. It is El Shaddai.[4] There is nothing

---

were inherited. That these "high places" have benn genuine Yahwe sanctuaries seems to be implied in 1 Samuel 9:12; 10:10; and 1 Kings 3:2-4. That, however, the "high places" were the locations for the worship of foreign deities or of Canaanized Yahwe cult we know through the prophets (Hosea 10:8; Amos 7:9; Isaiah 16:12; Jeremiah 7:31). The deuteronomistic work of history judges each king on his relationship to the "high places", whether he removed them or left them untouched. See 2 Kings 12:3 and also Marvin H. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955), p. 14.

[1] G.A. Danell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament (Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeriaktiebolag, 1946).

[2] Ibid., p. 17.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Genesis 35:11

mysterious about this encounter, and there is no struggle. Is El Shaddai the same god who wrestled with Jacob at the river Jabbok? Danell thinks so.[1] Both times Jacob received his new name from the god of the country, from El Shaddai.

The second time the purpose of this renaming is explicit and clear: Jacob shall inherit the country. According to Danell this is also true for the first encounter. His argument is not convincing. Danell is probably right in saying that, taking the view of Genesis as a whole, it is Yahwe who fights with Jacob and it is Yahwe who promises the inheritance of the country. But the second story seems to reflect a situation where the identification between Yahwe, the god of the fathers, and El Shaddai, the god of the country, has been established. Genesis 32, however, seems to know nothing about this identification. It is still aware of a difference between the god of the fathers and El Shaddai. The meaning of the fight can only mean that Jacob, and with him his god, had to force their way into the country which was the country of El Shaddai. Jacob wrestled with El and overcame the god of the country, which means, according to ancient thinking, that Jacob's god was stronger than the god of the country. This explanation would support the traditional meaning of the name Israel as "he wrestles with El".

---

[1] Danell, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

Danell offers a number of verbs from which the first element of the name "Israel" could be derived.[1] Advancing the opinion of Naor and Cheyne, Danell says that there is also the possibility that the first element in the name "Israel" originally was אשׁר, which would be the male equivalent of the goddess אשׁרה;[2] "Israel" then would consist of the roots אשׁר and אל. The meaning of the name "Israel" would be "Asher is El", or "Asher is god". This would explain the different vocalization of the Masoretes, who tried to conceal this original meaning of "Israel". This also would shed new light on the massebah Jacob erected at Bethel.[3] The name of this massebah would be "Asher". The "stone of Israel" in Genesis 49:24 (אבן ישׂראל) would receive new meaning through this interpretation. Danell considers אביר יעקב a parallel expression.[4] The "bull of Jacob" makes the parallelism complete, since both massebah and bull are fertility symbols.

---

[1] Danell, op. cit., p. 23. The alternatives are to fight; שׂרה to persevere, to persist; שׂרה to shine; שׂרה to rule, to dominate; ישׁר to heal; ישׁר to be straight, upright; אשׁר to be happy; here the name of the tribe and the god Asher also belongs. Even the argument that names formed from the verbs ל״ה and derived from the verb שׂרא should have been vocalized either יְשִׂרְאֵל or יִשְׂרְאֵל, but not יִשְׂרָאֵל, is not weighty enough, for the Masoretic vocalizing is of late date and does not necessarily reflect the original.

[2] Ibid., pp. 25ff.

[3] Genesis 35:14. See Danell, op. cit., p. 39 also.

[4] Danell, op. cit., p. 39.

Certainty about the correct derivation of the name "Israel" cannot be reached. But there are a number of names in the Old Testament which clearly reveal their relationship to Canaanite names. In this category belong names formed with the theophorous elements melech, adon, baal, and the common Semitic words ab, ach, and el. Examples of the former are to be found in the name of Adoni-zedek in Joshua 10:1,3,[1] and Melchi-zedek, the ancient king of Jerusalem who is mentioned in Genesis 14:18.[2] Noth pointed out the similar original meaning of the names adon and melech, melech meaning originally not king but leader.[3] The line ab/ach-adon-melech shows a development corresponding to the changing cultural situations when tribal religion among the Canaanites changes the old tribal leader into the divine head of some political urban community.[4]

In contrast to adon-melech, baal seemed to have been original to Palestine, a pre-Canaanite deity. He was the lord of the country, the furtherer of vegetation, who was confined locally to a mountain, spring, or bush/tree. Later baal and adon-melech exchanged their realms. Baal could become the lord

---

[1] Cf. also Judges 1:5ff.

[2] Cf. also Psalm 110:4.

[3] Martin Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemein-semitischen Namengebung (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928), pp. 115ff.

[4] Ibid.

of a city as he did in Tyre, and melech could adopt characteristics of the fertility baal.

Names formed with the theophorus element adon we find in Adonijah, one of David's sons,[1] and Adoniram, one of David's officers.[2] Other names with the element melech are Abimelech[3] and Yehimilk, king of Byblos.[4] Names with the element baal appear in Judges 8:29 (Jerubbaal) and in 2 Samuel 2:12 (Ishbaal, the son of Saul).[5] We also find traces of the theophorus element Anath in biblical names such as Anathoth, and in Anath, whose son was Shamgar.[6]

---

[1] 2 Samuel 1:7f.

[2] 1 Kings 4:6.

[3] Judges 8:31ff.

[4] James Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 499, hereafter referred to as ANET.

[5] The name Ishbaal is preserved unchanged only in 1 Chronicles 8:33 and 9:39. In 2 Samuel the name is transformed into Ishbosheth, because it contained the theophorus element Baal which in later Israel was tabu. See Noth, Geschichte Israels, p. 167, footnote 1, and Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York, Harper and Bros., 1941), p. 87.

[6] The etymological analysis of personal names reveals to us the ethnic and religious structure of a people. The fact oldest Israelite personal names differ from those names used in Israel after the time of the judges show that the core of the Israelite people was not of Canaanite but of (proto) Aramaic origin. See Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen..., p. 45. As we have tried to show, numerous Canaanite elements appear in Israelite personal names after the settlement in Canaan, indicating Canaanite influence through blood (marriage) and religion. Canaanite theophorus elements show how much Canaanite deities had gained a position in the religious life of Israel.

For some references to the theophorus name Anath, see Judges 3:31; 5:6.

Ancestor Worship

Ancestor gods or *teraphim*[1] we meet first in the story of Laban and Jacob in Genesis 31:19ff. Rachel steals the *teraphim* from Laban to secure them for Jacob. The *teraphim* probably are figurines[2] representing the ancestor of the tribe or family. The presence of the ancestor guarantees blessing to the whole clan and signifies the leadership of the one with whom they are dwelling. Connected with the right of leadership may be some property right, as H.G. May has pointed out: "The teraphim constituted the title to the chief inheritance portion and leadership of the family."[3] This may explain the action of Rachel, who tried to secure the superiority of Jacob over Laban. That the *teraphim* were associated with property right also seems to be meant in Exodus 22:6-7, where the oath is sworn before *elohim* "or possibly court teraphim".[4]

---

[1] See Millar Burrows, *What Mean These Stones* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), p. 220, Aage Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1957), II, p. 50, and Wilhelm Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch uber das Alte Testament* (Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1949), p. 890, all understand תרפים as housegods. Against this equation see Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 169, footnote 1.

[2] Cf. 1 Samuel 19:13,16, where *teraphim* can look like human beings.

[3] Herbert Gordon May, "The Patriarchal Idea of God," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LX (1941), p. 127, hereafter referred to as *JBL*.

[4] *Ibid.*

The opinion that elohim and teraphim can mean the same is also advanced by Draffkorn. She cites two passages where teraphim and elohim are absolute equivalents.[1] In Genesis 31:30 and Judges 18:24 the term elohim is used, whereas the same context refers to them also as teraphim in Genesis 31:19 and Judges 18:14,17,20. Because the teraphim appear as elohim in the Code of the Covenant, which is of Canaanite origin, May seems to take this as proof that the teraphim also are of Canaanite origin.[2] In Judges 17:18 we cannot detect any animosity on the part of Micah and the Danites towards the supposedly Canaanite institution of the teraphim. There is a certain similarity between the stories of Genesis 31 and 18. Both accounts tell about the immense value those teraphim must have had. Judges 18:24 illustrates this best: "You have taken my gods ... so what have I left?" We do not hear anything about the Danites stealing other goods besides the teraphim and the Levite. All his material goods must have been left unharmed, but Micah values the stolen teraphim more than anything else he owns. The same mood seems to govern Laban in Genesis 31. To be deprived of teraphim meant to be deprived of blessing, luck, and fortune.

---

[1] Anne E. Draffkorn, "Ilani/Elohim," JBL, LXXVI (1957), p. 222.

[2] May, JBL, LX (1941), p. 127.

It is not possible to decide on the basis of the textual account whether ancestor/*teraphim* worship was of Canaanite origin or something known to the nomadic clans of the desert.

El

The most common name for god in Palestine is El. El seems to be the supreme god as long as Baal does not dethrone him. He appears in the Old Testament texts and in extra-biblical accounts in many variations: El Elyon,[1] El Shaddai,[2] El 'olam,[3] El Roi,[4] El Berith,[5] or merely as El, Elyon, or Shaddai.[6] Whether we have always the same god or various gods is not quite clear. Usually his "surnames" are regarded as titles.[7] Frequently those different names are connected with different sanctuaries throughout the country. Thus Bethel belongs to Bethel,[8] El Berith to Shechem, and El Elyon to Jerusalem. Melchizedek, the priest of El at Jerusalem, may indicate a second title of El which was at home in Jerusalem, 'Elmlk. We know that

---

[1] Genesis 14:19, etc.

[2] Genesis 17:1, etc.

[3] Genesis 21:33, etc.

[4] Genesis 16:13, etc.

[5] Judges 9:46.

[6] See Numbers 24:4 and Deuteronomy 32:8. Note the Ugaritic titles for El: tpn 'el, dp 'el, 'el mlk, sr 'el, which indicate the name development. Refer to May, JBL, LX (1941), p. 114, and D. Nielsen, Ras Shamra Mythologie und biblische Theologie (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1936), p. 16.

[7] May, JBL, LX (1941), p. 115.

[8] See Pope, op. cit., p. 59: "A West Semitic god Bethel has long been known from cuneiform sources, from the Old Testament, and from the Elephantine papyri."

this is a title of El at Ugarit. Another parallel between Jerusalem and Ugarit lies in the use of the name El Elyon, the creator of heaven and earth.[1] The old tradition did not consider the god El Elyon a competitor for Yahwe; Abraham swears on the name of Yahwe, the El Elyon.[2] Another tradition which probably came through Jerusalem to Israel is the tradition of El Elyon's fight against chaos. Because El dwells in Jerusalem, the city does not tremble.[3] 1 Samuel 2:10a tells of a pre-exilic hymn from Jerusalem: "Yahwe, your adversaries will be beaten, Elyon in heaven destroys them."[4]

Possibly Pope is right in assuming that originally Elyon was a celestial deity quite distinct from El.[5] Elyon then would be related to Alalu of the Hittite mythology. This would be supported by the writings of Philo of Byblos, who said that Elyon was older than El by two divine generations. In the Old Testament the name Elyon independently

---

[1] Genesis 14:19,22: קנה שׁמים וארץ. What does qnh mean here? Usually it means "to acquire, to possess". The possible explanation would be that El is the possessor/ owner of heaven and earth because he created them; see Herbert Schmid, "Jahwe und Jerusalem," ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 181. In Ugarit it is qnyn El, "our creator El"; see May, JBL, LX (1941), but according to Pope, op. cit., pp. 49-50, the evidence for El's being a creator god is not at all explicit, however probable. The Ugaritic texts usually allude to El's creativity in the terms of generation, which has a sexual connotation present.

[2] Genesis 14:22.

[3] Psalm 46:3.

[4] Schmid, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 183.

[5] Pope, op. cit., p. 52.

occurs only twice, in Psalm 9:3 and Isaiah 14:14; otherwise it is always used together with or in parallelism to El, Elohim, and Yahwe. The original independent names of the Canaanite gods El Elyon, El Bethel and El 'olam became in Israel to be considered as alternative, attributes, or epithets of Yahwe.[1] Via El Elyon, the idea of God dwelling in heaven came into Israel. Heaven is God's dwelling place, from whence he comes to interfere in earthly events and to reveal himself.[2]

Another more general name for El is Shaddai. El Shaddai seems to be an equivalent for El Elyon. At least this is indicated in Numbers 24:4. El Shaddai is not associated with any particular sanctuary. Albright, Burrows and others have related Shaddai to the cuneiform sadu, meaning mountain.[3] El Shaddai shares here with Baal, El (to a certain extent), and Yahwe, the occupation of a holy mountain: "... the Sumerian Ziggurats, the hills of Shamash in the east, the recesses and heights of Saphon ... were the thrones of the deities."[4]

---

[1] Cf. Yahwe Elyon in Genesis 14:22 and Yahwe El 'olam in Genesis 21:33. See also Pope, op. cit., p. 14.

[2] Richard Hentschke, Die Stellung der vorexilischen Schriftpropheten zum Kultus (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957), p. 48. Here Hentschke cites Genesis 11:5; 18:21; 21:17; 22; 24:7; 28:12; Exodus 19:11,18,20; 20:22; Deuteronomy 4:36; 26:15; Isaiah 31:4; Psalm 2:4, etc.

[3] May, JBL, LX (1941), p. 122.

[4] Ibid., p. 123.

More evidence for the identity of El Elyon and El Shaddai is found in Psalm 46:4: "There is a river whose streams make glad the city of El, the holiest habitation of Elyon." This points towards the Ugaritic tradition, according to which El dwells on a mountain from which two streams (nhrm) and also floods (thmtm) flowed.[1] Jerusalem here takes the position of the world mountain, the abode of El.[2] For the two streams of the mountain Jerusalem one may take the Shiloah and the Rogel springs. "In the Old Testament _tehom_, _tehomot_ generally refer to the subterannean supply of sweet water, the source of the fountains, springs and rivers that come out of the earth, as contrasted with the celestial reservoir whence comes the rain."[3]

---

[1] Schmid, _ZAW_, LXVII (1955), p. 187.

[2] For Jerusalem as the mountain of God, see Psalm 48:2-4.

[3] Pope, _op. cit._, p. 63. Cf. also Genesis 7:17; 8:2; 49:29; Deuteronomy 8:7 and 32:17. Sometimes _thm_ is used for the waters of the Red Sea from which the Israelites were delivered, as in Exodus 15:5,8 and Isaiah 63:13, etc.

Baal

After the "Israelites" had invaded the country, they underwent basic sociological changes. It was the change from a small-animal, nomad existence to complete settlement; the nomadic way of life was surrendered in favor of the agricultural way of life. Thus it is understandable that their god or gods had to adjust themselves to the new environment and conditions. We heard about El and all his variations, but it strikes the observer that we hardly hear of any struggle between El and Yahwe. The situation was quite different with another god of the fertile country, Baal. One can say that the regulation of the relationship between Yahwe and Baal proved to be the major problem of Israel during the time between invasion and exile.

Yahwe did not seem to have anything to do with the life of the farmer, for he was a nomadic god. The question was: how much could Yahwe accept of Baal's nature without losing his identity? Baal seems to have been a much more powerful competitor with Yahwe than El ever was. Baal seems to have once usurped the position of El. In Ugaritic mythology this usurpation of power by Baal is justified because of El's impotence. Baal takes El's wife Ashera, who is the first goddess of the pantheon; the first goddess has to be associated with the first god, in this case Baal. Baal is the god of fertility and rain. He fights a continuous struggle

against Moth, who is the lord over summertime when the land is dry. Baal overcomes Moth with the rain in the fall, and fertility returns.[1] Baal is the "rider of the clouds",[2] longing for a house as the other gods have houses.[3] His abode is the mountain in the north, Zaphon. This name is known to us from Ras Shamra, where Zaphon is the place which is the abode of all gods, a Canaanite Olympus. It has been suggested that this mountain might be identical with the Amanus mountain in the north of Ugarit.[4]

The most common image of Baal is the bull. As bull, Baal appears the first time in the Old Testament in Exodus 32. Aaron the priest makes the golden bull and Moses, the fighter for Yahwe, destroys it. This story condemns bull worship in a programmatical way, as Moses once and for all passed judgment on the practice of bull worship which was adopted by the Israelites after their entry into the country. Bull worship must be an old tradition, for Jeroboam I (925 B.C.) designates the bull idol explicitly as the symbol of Yahwe, who

---

[1] ANET, I AB ii. Aubrey Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955), p. 81, finds in Psalm 48 a parallel to the Ugaritic myth of the struggle between Baal and Moth. Yahwe's enemy in Psalm 48, over whom he triumphs, is "death".

[2] Psalm 68. See also ANET, II AB iii.

[3] ANET, II AB v.

[4] J.W. Jack, The Ras Shamra Tablets (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1935), p. 19. Here Jack cites a note in the annals of Tiglath-pileser III which says that Baal Zaphon was rich in copper mines. This would favor a location in Lebanon rather than in Amanus.

brought the forefathers out of Egypt.[1] The institution of bull representations in Dan and Bethel was, at least in Dan, probably based on old Canaanite Baal traditions.[2] Dan is situated north of Lake Huleh. There Baal goes, according to Ugaritic texts, to celebrate marriage and the throne-ascension.[3] Before the Israelites conquered Dan (then called Laish), it was connected with Sidon,[4] and may have been a Phoenician colony.

Frequently in the Old Testament we hear about Baalim. The plural may indicate that we do not always encounter _the_ Baal, but rather that in popular Yahwism there may have been quite a number of Baalim with different responsibilities for the agricultural year, or of mere local significance. In that case, Baalim simply designates the Canaanite gods as a whole.[5] Together with the Baalim, the cult practices of Baal worship entered into the Israelite cult. The holy marriage of Anath/Ashera with Baal probably was re-enacted

---

[1] Kurt Galling, _Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels_ (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1928), p. 8. Here Galling considers the bull an image of Yahwe, but it is agreed by many scholars that the bull is merely the pedestal for the god and not the god himself.

[2] _Ibid_.

[3] _ANET_, IV AB ii, pp. 8ff.; IV AB ii, p. 9, 12. See also Widengren, _op_. _cit_., p. 9.

[4] Judges 18:7,28.

[5] Cf. Judges 2:11; 3:7; 8:33; 10:10; 1 Samuel 7:4; 23:10, etc.

in the cult. 2 Kings 23:4-7 polemizes against temple prostitution, and Deuteronomy 23:18-19 prohibits it, but no direct mention is made of the sexual rites. Frequently we can discover through implication what is going on. For instance, the daughters of Canaan are said to make the Israelites go whoring after their gods.[1] Only at the end of Israel's autonomous history do we find the sacred orgies of the temple prostitution explicitly mentioned and condemned.[2]

Although popular Baalism may frequently have given Yahwe a wife, the canonical texts never say anything about this. But we hear terminology which reminds us of fertility cult practices: Israel is the beloved of Yahwe,[3] and Hosea opposes Yahwe's being called "my Baal". Ezekiel talks about Jerusalem as the wife of Yahwe.[4] The Song of Songs is the most convincing literary remnant of the popularity of the actual re-enactment of sacred marriage between Baal and Anath. The Sitz im Leben of the Song of Songs is the New Year's festival.[5] The role of Solomon in the Song of Songs is that of Baal, and accordingly Solomon's wife is Shulamit, the

---

[1] Exodus 34:16.

[2] Deuteronomy 23:18. Also in the report of Josiah's reform: 2 Kings 23:7.

[3] Hosea 2:18.

[4] Ezekiel 23.

[5] Song of Solomon 3:3f.; 5:6,8. Cf. Widengren, op. cit., p. 78.

[illegible] [illegible] given [illegible]

prostitution, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

on Ghost worship [illegible] some of the [illegible]

we can discover through legislative [illegible] For

instance, the [illegible] the Levi-

ites to [illegible] [illegible]

outrageous [illegible] [illegible] temple

prostitute [illegible] [illegible]

Although popular [illegible] frequently [illegible]

Yahweh's wife, [illegible]

this. But [illegible]

cult [illegible]

opposed [illegible] being called [illegible]

Jerusalem as the [illegible]

must [illegible] of the [illegible] of the

[illegible]

The [illegible] of the [illegible]

Jehovah. [illegible]

of [illegible], and [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

feminine form of the theophorus name Solomon.[1] The king himself is the offspring of divine marriage.[2]

Under Ahab, Baal seems to have invaded even the official cult at Samaria . As Solomon installed the cult of the Sidonian Astarte in Jerusalem,[3] thus Ahab installed for his Syrian wife the cult of the Tyrian Baal in Samaria.[4] This Baal's name was Melkart, that is, "city king". Solomon worshipped the Sidonian Ashtart and the Ammonite Milcom and built a shrine for the Moabite Chemosh.[5] Just how official this cult of the Tyrian Baal was in Samaria we have no way of knowing. Ahab gave good Yahwe names to his sons, as we read in 1 Kings 22:40 and 2 Kings 8:16. It is not by accident that the traditors have included in the account of Ahab the story of Elijah and the Baal prophets.[6]

Alt has investigated this tradition.[7] His thesis is that we have the account of straightening out the Israelite border because the Carmel mountain, having been in Tyrian

---

[1] Widengren, op. cit.

[2] Isaiah 7:14-17.

[3] 1 Kings 11:1.

[4] 1 Kings 16:31.

[5] 1 Kings 11:5-7.

[6] 1 Kings 17:18.

[7] Alt, Kleine Schriften..., II, pp. 135-46.

possession, at that time reached far into Israelite territory. This explains the greatness of the event and its being a national enterprise. However, the traditor, according to Alt, has garbled the account by identifying the Baal of Carmel with the Tyrian Baal who became prominent in Israel through Jezebel, Ahab's wife, a Phoenician princess. As the story proceeds the Tyrian Baal does not play any role any longer. This makes it clear that we encounter here the Baal of the Carmel mountain, a mountain deity like the Baal of the Lebanon, or the Baal of the Hermon, known to us from Judges 3:3.[1] 1 Kings 17-18 offers then, in programmatical form, an account of the cultic situation in Israel at Ahab's time; the theme of 1 Kings 17-18 is the sole kingship of Yahwe in Israel. This demand is formulated by Elijah: "If the Lord be god, follow him, but if the Baal, follow him."[2]

---

[1] Otto Eissfeldt, "Ras Schamra," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXIV (1939), hereafter referred to as TL.

[2] 1 Kings 18:21b. All quotations are from The Complete Bible, An American Translation, eds. J.M.P. Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923), unless otherwise noted.

Anath/Asherah

The Ras Shamra texts already testify to the identity of Anath and Asherah. Baal is the bull who copulates with Anath the young cow, and she gives birth to a bull calf. Anath is the _paredros_ of Baal in Ugarit, and she appears as the _paredros_ of Yahwe in the Elephantine texts. Widengren therefore concludes that Anath was worshipped already in Israelite Canaan as the wife of Yahwe.[1] The Israelite emigrants brought this cult to Elephantine, together with the worship of Baal. Widengren is supported by Noth: Anath is the mother-symbol and vegetation goddess which came to Elephantine before the exile and before the time of Deuteronomy.[2]

In our discussion of Baal, we touched already the role of the marriage of Baal and Anath in Canaanite cult rites. If Anath also was the wife of Yahwe, we may have to accept the Song of Songs as the remnant of a fertility liturgy. The symbolism of the sacred marriage, the death and rise of the vegetation deity, the corresponding terminology of "godly seeds", "god sows", the "seeking" and "finding" of Yahwe, all these were alive in popular Yahwism.[3]

---

[1] Widengren, _op. cit._, p. 86, footnote 69.

[2] Noth, _Die israelitischen Personennamen ..._, p. 122.

[3] Beatrice A. Brooks, "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," _JBL_, LX (1941), p. 229.

We mentioned already that Astarte had a place of worship in Jerusalem at the time of Solomon. In Jeremiah 44:17 we hear that sacrifices were offered to the "Queen of Heaven" in Jerusalem. The Queen of Heaven was no one but Anath. If this be true, temple prostitution would receive much stronger support as a genuine element of popular Yahwist worship.[1] "Israel had played the harlot and gone after other gods" is the accusation of the prophets.[2]

In the sanctuaries, female cult prostitutes, the qedeshoth, were devoted to the service of Anath and Yahwe. In 1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, and 22:46, these prostitutes are mentioned in connection with pillars, high places, and Asherah. Josiah tore down the houses of the qedeshoth.[3] Another word for the cult prostitute is zonoth. In Genesis 38:22,24 and Hosea 4:14, qedeshoth and zonoth have been used synonymously. Generally speaking, the zonah is mentioned more often than any other woman connected with the fertility cult.[4] The verbal root belonging to zonah is used throughout the Old Testament to denote Israel's whoring after other gods. "The root meaning of the verb in several Semitic languages

---

[1] Walter Baumgartner, "Ugaritische Probleme und ihre Tragweite für das Alten Testaments," Theologische Zeitschrift, 1947, p. 97, hereafter referred to as TZ.

[2] Hosea 4:10,13,14,15; 5:3, etc.

[3] 2 Kings 23:7.

[4] Brooks, JBL, LX (1941), p. 236.

(Arab, Syrian, and Ethiopian) implied the idea of illicit intercourse."[1]

---

[1] Brooks, JBL, LX (1941), p. 239.

Yahwe

We must look briefly at the divine name Yahwe. Many scholars have attempted to recover the original meaning of the name Yahwe, or at least to discover its origin or etymological roots. But all attempts have failed thus far. A stumbling-block for all explanations has been the "self-revelation" of Yahwe in Exodus 3:14: אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה. The translation "I am who I am" is problematic and does not further our insight into the meaning of the name Yahwe. Assuming that this translation would be right from a grammatical viewpoint, the root "to be", *hwy*, appears as such only in Proto-Semitic; the Hebrew root for "to be" is *hyy*.[1]

Another possibility would be to derive the name from the Arabic root *hwy*, which means "to blow". If Yahwe were a deity of the desert who originated with the nomadic forefathers of the Israelites, the meaning "to blow" would offer some explanation.

Eissfeldt believes he has discovered the name of Yahwe in Beirut.[2] Bauer finds Yahwe to be one of the sons of El in Ugarit,[3] only to be contested by Baumgartner, who

---

[1] Theophile James Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1917), p. 109.

[2] Otto Eissfeldt, *Sanchunjaton von Beirut und Ilumilku von Ugarit* (Halle: M. Niemeyer Verlag, 1952).

[3] Hans Bauer, "Die Gottheiten von Ras Shamra," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LI (1933), p. 91f, hereafter referred to as *ZAW*.

rejects the appearance of Yahwe in Ugaritic texts because the text is uncertain.[1] The only solution Baumgartner has to offer is that he joins his argument with Meek's in the hypothesis of the southern origin of Yahwe, believing that Yahwe is a desert deity.[2] Meek prefers to derive the name from hwy, indicating that Yahwe was some kind of weather god. This seems to be supported by Judges 5, where Yahwe appears with storm, rain, and earthquake. Yahwe comes from Seir, which may be a mountain or a volcano.[3] But those characteristics are not able to bear the argument, for all of them are found to be characteristics of Baal also, which means that Yahwe was already in a position where he had taken over certain Baal features.

The only way to gain deeper insight into the character - not the name - of Yahwe seems to be an investigation of the "god of the fathers".

---

[1] Baumgartner, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

[2] Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

[3] Judges 5:4. Sinai references are found in Exodus 3:1ff. and 19:3.

Moloch/Melech

In our discussion of personal names we discovered the theophorus element mlk. Mlk must have been a title of deities, and a divine proper name.[1] In popular Yahwism, Yahwe had been identified with the deity Melech and also had received the title melech. The worship of Melech was not confined to the Israelites. For instance, we hear about the "Milkom of the Ammonites" in 1 Kings 11:5,33. Although the expression "Moloch" is avoided in the original text, Isaiah 30:27-33 seems to be a description of a Moloch sacrifice.[2] A great sacrificial fireplace is found (thophet) and human sacrifice is indicated in verse 32.[3] To the cult of the Canaanite Moloch belonged the sacrifice of children. Under the kings Ahaz and Manasseh, "who made his son to pass through the fire according to the abominations of the nations ..."[4], the cult of Moloch had enjoyed some official standing.

---

[1] Pope, op. cit., p. 26.

[2] Hugo Gressmann, Der Messias (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929), pp. 111-12.

[3] Cf. also Micah 6:7.

[4] 2 Kings 16:3; 21:6.

Zion

As Zaphon was the mythological center of the gods of Ugarit and the location of Baal, thus Zion was the seat or the throne of Yahwe.[1] That Mount Zion was associated with Zaphon among the Israelites is stated in Psalm 48:2: "the hill of Zion in the far north". As we mentioned before, Zaphon means north. In the beginning, Zion and Jerusalem may not have been identified together, for in Psalm 48 Zion does not seem to fit the location of Jerusalem, as Jerusalem was not in the north. Another explanation of 48:2 would be that here we have preserved an old knowledge of the seat of the gods in the north; this tradition transferred the seat of the gods to Zion, the holy hill of Jerusalem, in order to make Yahwe the king of the earth instead of Baal. The kingship of Yahwe is one of the great themes in the Psalms.[2] From Zion, Yahwe pronounces judgment upon the assembled kings of the nations.[3] Yahwe has chosen Zion just as he has chosen the Davidic monarchy. Here on Zion Yahwe rests, and here Yahwe has his throne and the throne of his anointed. Actually the throne of David and the throne of Yahwe are one.[4]

---

[1] Isaiah 8:18; 11:9; 18:1; 24:23; Jeremiah 31:12; Micah 4:7, etc.

[2] See especially Psalms 29 and 47.

[3] Psalm 82.

[4] Psalm 110:1 and Psalm 78. Cf. also von Rad, *Theologie...*, p. 54.

Thus we find the qualities and characteristics of Zaphon, the seat of the Ugaritic Pantheon of the far north, transferred to Mount Zion. Yahwe had been identified with Baal, and the location of the throne of Baal became the location of the throne of Yahwe. In Israelite mythology, however, we have a certain historification. Zaphon becomes Zion, which is not some mystical mountain in the far north but is the place where Yahwe installs his anointed; Zion thus becomes the temple in Jerusalem.

Canaanite Feasts

In Exodus 34:18,22; 20:22-26; 22:17-23:19 and Deuteronomy 16 we find festal calendars which refer to three great feasts, the first of which is the feast of unleavened bread, or the feast of Massoth. This first festival was celebrated, according to Exodus 34:18, during the spring in the month of Abib, which corresponds to the Babylonian Nisan. This feast eventually was combined with the Passover.[1] The next feast is the feast of weeks or of first fruit, which is also a spring festival.

The third and most important of the feasts is the great autumn festival of ingathering,[2] which also was called the feast of booths or the feast of tabernacles.[3] This feast took place בצאת השנה, which may be translated "the going out of the year" or "the going forth of the year".[4] Some scholars consider this phrase as meaning "the end of the year",[5] or it is interpreted as the beginning

---

[1] Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 286. The question of whether or not the Passover was originally a Canaanite feast or of nomadic origin will be discussed later under "The Faith of the Fathers". Cf. also S.H. Hooke (ed.), *Origins of Early Semitic Ritual* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), p. 47.

[2] Judges 21:19; 1 Kings 8:2; 12:32; the חג האסף Exodus 23:16; 34:22.

[3] חג הסכות Leviticus 23:34-36; Deuteronomy 16:13-15, 16; Numbers 29:12-38.

[4] Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 49, and Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

[5] Alt, *Kleine Schriften*, I, p. 327, and Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

of the year. Gray argues that "when the year begins, the sun goes forth from his chamber to shine".[1] Perhaps the best rendering would be "the turn of the year".[2] The feast of tabernacles stands at the end of the agricultural year in the fall. For Israel it means also the beginning of the new year, of a new period of life. The view that the feast of ingathering was connected with the agricultural New Year is due to the Gezer Calendar, which Johnson dates in the tenth century B.C.[3] This calendar begins the year with the agricultural responsibility of "ingathering".

These three festivals were connected with the seasons of the year; in other words, they had their *Sitz im Leben* in the life of an agricultural society. When the "Israelites" had to change their way of life, they adopted these festivals from the Canaanites. The feasts had to undergo some change in emphasis, however. The feast of tabernacles indicated not only the beginning in the cycle of life in nature, but it also marked a renewal of the relationship between Israel and Yahwe. The gospel of the feast of tabernacles was the tradition of the exodus from Egypt and the reading of the apodictic law.[4] It was the experience of the first covenant which was celebrated here.

---

[1] Psalm 19:6. See Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

[2] תקופת השׁנה Exodus 34:22. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Alt, *Kleine Schriften*, I, p. 328.

The Casuistic Law

The casuistic law may be called the "civil rights" of Israel. This type of law is distinguished from apodictic law, which is the law of the covenant. The casuistic law had little or no significance for Israel's relationship with Yahwe. Even the literary form is different from that of the apodictic law. Casuistic law formulations usually are introduced by "in case, that". This type of law does not know anything about official judges, and we hear very little about priests enforcing the law. The casuistic laws are only of cultic significance when the deity becomes a witness in an act of justice.[1] The executors of this law are the free men, the chieftain or elders of a clan, family or tribe.

Where did the casuistic law originate? Together with all the other adjustments and adaptations which were made, the nomadic elements adopted the law of the Canaanites. The casuistic law assumes situations into which the "Israelites" were only introduced after they had entered the country. This explains also the failure of this law to show any particular ethnic or religious affiliation.[2] We do not know any of the original sources of this Canaanite law, but it appears to be ancient, and may even have been foreign to the Canaanites when they first entered Palestine.

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 289.

[2] Ibid., p. 296.

Conclusion

The Old Testament mentions numerous customs, rites, and divine names which were connected not with the desert past of Israel, but with the inhabitants of the country which they invaded. The contact with the Canaanites left a deep mark on Israel's faith. The new environment and the change from a nomadic to an agricultural form of life demanded innovations which had no precedent in Israel.

Names of Canaanite deities appear, marking the influence of Canaanite fertility religion on the faith of the new settlers. Accordingly, the feasts of the agricultural year were adopted and with them the cyclical understanding of life spread in Israel. Names, terminology - especially of the cult - and the worship of Canaanite deities show us how strong the country which they had invaded formed the Israelites.

Yahwe, the Israelite god, assumed features which originally belonged to other deities. This surely was a genuine development from the viewpoint of the Canaanites; there was plenty of room in their pantheon. The Old Testament, however, as we shall see, takes a different attitude; it battles this identification of Yahwe with Baal, etc. To understand the opposite poles in this tension between Canaanite cult and Israelite faith, we tried to explain briefly the first pole: Canaanite fertility religion and its cultic emphasis. The second pole is provided by "Israel's" past: the faith of the fathers.

CHAPTER II

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS

CHAPTER II

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS

The pre-Mosaic forefathers of Israel did not worship Yahwe. If there is any value in our tradition and if it is true that names reflect the religion of a people, this could easily be proven. The tradition preserved the knowledge of an initial revelation of Yahwe to Moses.[1] Names formed with the element "Yahwe" appear infrequently in Israel until the time of the monarchy. The first one to our knowledge to use this element is the name Joshua. Later during the time of the judges we find five "Yahwe-names": יואש,[2] יותם,[3] מיכיהו,[4] יהונתן,[5] and יואל.[6] Besides the full form יהוה, we find the short form יהו, which is formed by dropping the final vocal sound ה and according to the ktl forms of the verbs tertiae ו. This short יה/יהו is known to us from Elephantine and from mugs excavated in

---

[1] Exodus 3:1f.

[2] Judges 6:11.

[3] Judges 9:5ff.

[4] Judges 17:1,4.

[5] Judges 18:30.

[6] 1 Samuel 8:2. See Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, p. 107, on these.

Jerico.[1]

As we have shown previously, all attempts to enlighten the etymological background of the name "Yahwe" are in vain. It seems to be more fruitful to try to find out what kind of god Yahwe was. Buber considers the short forms "Yah" or "Yahu" or"Yahuvah" as tabu words which are uttered in ecstasy and enthusiasm by the worshippers.[2] This short form was according to Buber common to the western Semites, "who hinted by it ... to the deity whose name could not be designated"[3]; therefore they just shouted "He" or "This one" or "Oh he".

---

[1] Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, p. 104.

[2] Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith (New York: Macmillan Co., 1949), p. 37.

[3] Ibid.

The Gods of the Fathers

The pre-Mosaic forefathers of Israel did not worship Yahwe; they worshipped the god(s) of the fathers.[1] It is the merit of Alt to have emphasized the particular character of the god(s) of the fathers in comparison with other deities.[2] We will follow Alt in his argumentation later. May[3] rejects the thesis of Alt. The patriarchs did not found the cult of the _God_ of Abraham, the _Pahad_ of Isaac, and the _Abir_ of Jacob; rather, they instituted the worship of the god Bethel at Bethel. For May the patriarchs worshipped the West-Semitic deity El. This seems to be the content of Genesis 14:19, which refers to the worship of El Elyon; of Genesis 17:1 and El Shaddai; of Genesis 21:33 and El 'olam; and of Genesis 16:13 and El Roi.

The name Isaac is really an abbreviation of _Yishaq-'el_, which means "El laughs". The same form of the verb also appears at Ugarit.[4] Jacob established the god Bethel in the city where, as the tradition goes, Jacob lived for

---

[1] There is at least one text which refers to the relationship between Yahwe and the god(s) of the fathers, Exodus 3; 6:13. The identity is here established between Yahwe and the god(s) of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but it is not assumed from the very beginning.

[2] Alt, _Kleine Schriften_, I, pp. 1-78.

[3] May, _JBL_ LX (1941), p. 126.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 115.

a while.[1] The fact that the tradition in Genesis does not previously mention the god Bethel, and that we do not have any earlier non-biblical witnesses for the existence of Bethel, indicates to May that the cult of the god Bethel was started at Bethel by Jacob. He quotes Eissfeldt for his support, but Eissfeldt points out only that Bethel is the home of the god Bethel, nothing more. Nothing is said about the establishment of this deity at Bethel through Jacob. The god Bethel therefore cannot be a "god of the fathers."[2]

May's problem is that he missed Alt's argument. Alt tries to establish a vital difference between the god(s) of the fathers and the Canaanite deities. We shall see that his argument goes in quite a different direction from May's. The tradition about the fathers reflects a stage in which Abram, Isaac, and Jacob still lived the life of the desert, only gradually penetrating into agricultural Canaan. All the stories about Bethel, El Elyon, El Roi, and El 'olam reflect the situation after the invasion of the "Israelites" had taken place, and are aetiological legends legitimating the different Canaanite sanctuaries through the tradition of the fathers. The fathers probably did not worship the deus loci but worshipped their own god(s) and would not then have

---

[1] Genesis 35:1. Cf. May, JBL, LX (1941),pp.119-120.

[2] Ibid., p. 120.

identified them with the deus loci.[1] Only in the moment no sanctuary is involved and the location is not Canaan do we hear nothing about Elim. In the struggle between Abraham and Laban the god involved is the god of Abraham and the פחד of Isaac. When Laban and Abraham conclude a covenant we even find two gods; Genesis 31:53 tells of the god of Abraham and the god of Nahor, who guarantee the covenant.

Outside the sagas of the fathers we find the god of the fathers mentioned in Genesis 49:25.[2] Joseph receives help from a god who is identified by a number of ancient names. Together with the אביר of Jacob the god(s) of the fathers appear.

The oldest among the names for the god(s) of the fathers are those not frequently used, the פחד יצחק and the אביר יעקב. The first appears only as one of the gods by whom Abraham swears the covenant with Yahwe in Genesis 31:42,53. The second one is used several times in later literature, Isaiah 49:26; 60:16, and Psalm 132:2,5.[3] In Isaiah 1:24 the expression אביר יעקב is changed into אביר ישׂראל, which was easy to do since Jacob and Israel were equated in poetical language. The פחד יצחק

---

[1] Cf. Genesis 46:1, where Jacob sacrifices to the god of his father Isaac at Beersheba and not to the El 'olam who is the lord of this particular sanctuary. Cf. also Genesis 21:33.

[2] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 19.

[3] Ibid., p. 25.

then would mean the god of Israel. The original meaning of the two names can hardly be recovered. The פחד יצחק must have terrified Isaac at the first revelation; terror must have been the characteristic which impressed Isaac most and thus became the designation for this numen. The אביר יעקב will have the same meaning.[1]

The traditio-historical analysis reveals that old traditions appear here and there in a literary work which is younger and shows a tendency to achieve a uniform picture of the past.[2] Such an analysis also reveals that the Semites entering the country did not immediately surrender the faith of the desert. Alt writes about parallel developments among the people of Palmyra, who also preserved some traces from their nomadic past.[3] All the gods we meet among nomads are gods without a name, known only through their connection with persons. We do not meet these types of gods in those regions which were never reached by Arabic invasions, namely the coastlands of Philistea and Phoenicia.

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 26.

[2] Ibid., p. 28.

[3] Ibid., p. 32.

The Difference Between the Gods of the Fathers and the Deities of Canaan

We have already discovered the difference between the god(s) of the fathers and the Elim of Canaan in regard to their traditio-historical situation. The Elim do not show any real consistency; they always appear only for a moment, depending on the location where the fathers live or worship. After their appearance they immediately drop again from the sphere of interest, while the god(s) of the fathers have a much more inclusive relationship to their worshippers. This indicates the essential difference between the god(s) of the fathers and the Elim; the Elim are tied to their cult places and sanctuaries, but the god(s) of the fathers are mobile. They do not have any particular sanctuary, but move with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob wherever they go.

According to Alt,[1] the author of the Priestly code has taken El Shaddai from his original cult place, which we no longer know. The purpose for this was apparently literary uniformity. But the authors of J and E were too close to the actual events; they did not dare hide the difference between the god(s) of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the Elim. The god(s) of the fathers are not related to any sanctuary,

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 21.

but live in a continuous relationship to a group of men, a clan, a family, or a tribe. We know from the Ras Shamra texts what it meant to a Canaanite god to be without a house, without a sanctuary. A sanctuary meant worshippers and power. "No house hath Baal like the gods, nor court like Ashera's children's."[1] "Receive, Baal, the glad tidings I bring thee. They will build thee a house like thy brethren's ... "[2]

The gods of the fathers have no names. They are known through the persons to whom they revealed themselves. Those persons may frequently have been the ancestors, chieftains, or leaders of nomadic clans, moving from one place to another. The one who received the first revelation would be the founder of the cult. The פחד יצחק was the god and leader of the clan of Isaac, just as the אביר יעקב was the god and leader of the family of Jacob. That the god of Abraham, the פחד יצחק, and the אביר יעקב could be identified is due to the fact that they shared the same mobile character; they were not tied to a place, but to a group of people, moving with them, leading them, and protecting them. That these gods were able to adjust themselves very easily to new conditions of life and to a new environment is clear.

---

[1] *ANET*, V AB e.

[2] *Ibid.*, II AB v. Cf. also Buber, *The Prophetic Faith*, p. 157.

Yahwe also belongs in the same category of gods with the god(s) of the fathers. When Yahwe revealed himself to Moses, he revealed himself as the god of the fathers. That this is not just the usual procedure of identification is demonstrated by the history of Israel. Yahwe remained the god of the desert. Sometimes he had to retain those qualities by overcoming his baalization. Even Sinai does not restrict Yahwe. Never is Sinai called the mountain of Yahwe, and we do not hear about an altar there. Sinai is the location where Yahwe chose to reveal himself, but it is not an abode such as Zaphon is the abode of Baal. Exodus 19:11,18 has preserved this knowledge; here Yahwe comes down upon Sinai in fire, but he does not dwell there. The same distinction between Yahwe and the mountain is made in Exodus 3:8.[1] Moses does not have "to visit" Yahwe, that is, to inquire in a sanctuary or at a cult place when he wants to talk to Yahwe. Moses just speaks wherever he is, and Yahwe answers him.[2]

Yahwe proves his power in the midst of a foreign country when he comes down into Egypt to deliver his children.[3] Phenomenology knows the god of Israel as a god of unrest, for the religion of Israel is a "religion of unrest

---

[1] Martin Buber, Königtum Gottes (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1936), p. 75.

[2] Exodus 5:22.

[3] Exodus 11:4; 12:12; 7:4.

(restlessness)".[1] Yahwe is "melech", who leads his people but who also leaves them, who comes to them but does not allow them to be "sure" of him at any moment. The ark is the symbol of his presence among men. It is never confined to any one place, and Yahwe migrates with the ark.[2] Yahwe's "presence is in his movement and his command over nature is contained in his command over history."[3]

The fathers belong, with all probability, to the great movement of the Habiru. Abram is called a "Hebrew"in Genesis 14:13.[4] "Habiru" is not a designation for an ethnic group. Rather it means someone "who crosses, a transient, nomad".[5] The "Habiru" are a bothersome element, always moving around the borders of states and cities, sometimes penetrating those borders and settling, or serving as mercenaries in foreign armies.[6] During the second millenium they appear in the writings of Egypt and in the Mari letters.[7]

---

[1] Van der Leeuw, *op. cit.*, p. 687.

[2] Numbers 10:35f.

[3] Van der Leeuw, *op. cit.*

[4] Cf. also Genesis 39:14,17; 40:15; 41:12, where Joseph is called a עברי. It is remarkable that he never calls himself a Habiru. It is always the 'native' calling the foreigner עברי, designating his social status. Cf. Mary P. Gray, "The Hābiru-Hebrew Problem in the Light of the Source Material Available at Present," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIX (1958), pp. 135-96.

[5] Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[6] Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

[7] *ANET*, p. 22. Cf. also the Beth-Shan Stelae of Seti I and Ramses II on p. 255 and the Mari letters on p. 483. The Amarna letters (EA N. 254) are found on p. 486.

Under Amenhophis and his son Echnaton, the "Habiru" are reported to have invaded Palestine, where they conquered cities like Jericho and Shechem.[1] The Genesis tradition seems to contradict at least partially the nomadic character of the fathers. They are described as farmers in Genesis 26:12,14; 27:28; 37:7. But they are also described as nomads in Genesis 13 and 37:12ff. It is doubtful whether this indicates that the fathers lived in a status of transition from nomadic to agricultural life. These traditions rather reflect the belief of later generations, which could no longer depict the fathers as nomads.

The names of the fathers belong to the oldest Israelite names. They are distinct from Phoenician forms of names and those which later, during the time of the judges, are in use in Israel. After the invasion Israel had largely assimilated Canaanite language and customs. The names of the fathers belong to a type of name which is proto-Aramaic.[2] This clearly supports what we have said about the nomadic descendency of the fathers, and the god(s) of the fathers, thus of Israel itself. It is Jacob who is called Israel, thus preserving the knowledge that at least the core of the later Israel is of Aramean origin.[3]

---

[1] Meek, op. cit., pp. 25f.

[2] Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen..., p. 45.

[3] Ibid.

Passover and the Apodictic Law

Two other remnants of Israel's nomadic past which were still preserved after the settlement in spite of the adoption of Canaanite casuistic and the celebration of agricultural feasts, are the Passover feast and the apodictic law. In commanding "thou shalt not kill", the apodictic law does not make any distinction between murder and manslaughter. The one who kills shall be killed. There is no possibility of monetary redemption or of an asylum for the killer as there is in Canaanite casuistic law. The apodictic law speaks with the authority of Yahwe. There is no "if" or "in case, that". It always talks only about the most grave crimes, without considering the minor ones.

Is the apodictic law unrealistic? The apodictic law really is removed from the reality of the daily legal complications. The Sitz im Leben of the apodictic law is a nomadic "society". The more primitive life of the desert, where the interdependency of the members of a family makes all transgressions heavier, where every death means loss of potentiality to the whole group, produces a law like the apodictic law. Just as the service of Yahwe has its origin in the desert, the apodictic law, which is closely connected with the service of Yahwe, has its origin among the nomads.[1] The tradition

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 330.

which links the first mention of the apodictic law with the covenant in the desert at Sinai, Exodus 20:2ff., is right to the extent that it knows the home of the "covenantal law" is not Canaan.[1]

In 2 Kings 23 the Passover appears for the first time in historical literature. This does not mean that it is of late origin. The Passover probably belongs to the nomadic rites, and may even go back further than the time of Moses.[2] Von Rad's view is supported by Hempel,[3] Mowinckel,[4] and Noth.[5] Our difficulty is that the Passover has come to us in a historized form. J and E mention the Passover as a commemoration of the "passing by" of the angel of the Lord, which saved them while the Egyptians were scourged.[6] For the Priestly code the Passover is _the_ exodus festival.[7] The whole tradition of the exodus becomes the cult legend of the Passover. In Canaan the Passover was combined with the feast of unleavened bread, which was historized also and became the

---

[1] Alt, _Kleine Schriften_, I, p. 331.

[2] Von Rad, _Theologie,.._, p. 25.

[3] Johannes Hempel, _Gott und Mensch im Alten Testament_ (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936), p. 14.

[4] Mowinckel, _Psalmenstudien II_, p. 205.

[5] Martin Noth, _Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament_ (München: Christian Kaiser, 1957), p. 37.

[6] Exodus 12:11f.; 12:27. Cf. also Mowinckel, _Psalmenstudien II_, p. 205.

[7] Exodus 13.

commemoration of the eating of unleavened bread during the exodus from Egypt. The Passover was celebrated in the month of Abib, the month of the exodus. In 2 Kings 23 the Passover seems to be connected with the renewal of the covenant. It is difficult to say how old this connection is. It is our thesis that Josiah took over a North-Israelite custom. The North probably had continued to celebrate the Passover as the major festival of the cultic year. With the revival of other old institutions Josiah also revived the Passover and its old significance. This thesis will be defended later.

The Location of the Father Traditions

The tradition of the fathers is mainly located at sanctuaries in Palestine. Whenever we hear about sacrifices and theophanies we find the fathers at those cult places. The reason for this connection of the tradition of the fathers with the country of the Canaanites will be seen when we deal with a period of time preceding the invasion of the "Israelites". Why do theophanies and cult institutions in the tradition of the fathers show no connection with the god(s) of the fathers, but establish a relationship to the Elim of the Canaanites? We have assumed above that the faith of the fathers was the faith of the invading nomadic elements. When the "Israelites" entered the country they found the cults of the Elim of Palestine well established, and since they occupied the sanctuaries of the Elim, it was necessary to establish the tradition of the fathers in the new environment. This is the reason for the nomadic faith in an agricultural setting.[1] Genesis puts the fathers chronologically before the invasion where they belonged. Thus the fathers become connected with later-occupied cult places even before occupation began. What was left from the time before the invasion were the cults and the names of the fathers. The cult legends of the desert were forgotten

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 50-51.

because they had no connection with the new situation.[1]

It is typical that the tradition which speaks most clearly about the gods of the fathers and about the fathers themselves, the story of the covenant between Laban and Abram, has nothing to do with Canaan, but reflects a purely nomadic atmosphere. We observe that the harmonization of the different tradition was not always successful. For instance, there is a discrepancy between the J and the E documents in the record of Jacob's experience at Bethel.[2] The J document talks about a revelation of the god of Abraham and Isaac and emphasizes the promise, while E seems to have preserved the old cult legend of the El Bethel.[3]

A similar discrepancy we find in Genesis 21:33 (J) and 46:1ff. (E). Abraham sacrifices at Beersheba to El 'olam, who is the numen of this sanctuary. Jacob, however, sacrifices at the same place to the god of his father Isaac.

The mention of the אביר יעקב in Jacob's blessing of Joseph seems to indicate a close relationship between Jacob and Joseph. This is supported through the fact that we find the center of the Jacob legends in the area which is later occupied by the "house Joseph".[4] Jacob did

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 50-51.

[2] Ibid. See Genesis 28:13-16, 18, 21 for J, and 28:11-12, 17-18, 20, 22 for E.

[3] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 50-51.

[4] See Eduard Nielsen, Shechem (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1955), p. 309. Here Bethel is mentioned in Genesis 28:11ff.;

not institute any one of these cult places, for they were all old Canaanite sanctuaries.[1] Beersheba seems to have been the only sanctuary with connection to the פחד יצחק.[2] The tradition about Abraham was perpetuated at the tree sanctuary of Mamre, which probably was associated with the city of Hebron.[3]

31:13; 35:7, 14. On p. 313 he cites Shechem as found in 33:18ff.; 35:2ff.; Manenaim in 32:2f.; Penuel in 32:25ff., and Sukkoth in 33:17.

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 52.

[2] Genesis 26; 46:1ff.

[3] Genesis 18; 22 (?).

The Covenant

It is in the Abraham tradition that we hear first about a covenant between the god "who brought" Abraham "out of the Chaldean city of Ur to give ... possession of this land" to Abraham.[1] This covenant is the divine guarantee for the fulfillment of the promise of the possession of "this land".[2] We hear about the same promise to Jacob, but it is unaccompanied by a covenant.[3]

Here for the first time the problematic history of covenants in the north and in the south appears. It is our thesis that the covenant with Abraham establishes the equality (if not the supremacy) of the south with the Yahwistic north. The tradition of the fathers presents Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as three generations in succession. This is unhistorical harmonization. The tradition about Jacob has nothing to do with the traditions of Abraham and Isaac originally. This is indicated already in the locations of the traditions.

Furthermore, the authors of J and E were not able to consolidate the election of Abraham with the later election of Israel under Moses. The Joseph tribes had been in Egypt;

---

[1] Genesis 15:7.

[2] Genesis 15:7 and 17:4.

[3] Genesis 28:13.

they were the bearers and receivers of the covenant of Sinai and later also at Shechem.[1] The covenant with Abraham is nothing but an anticipation of the later covenant at Shechem. Shechem was in all probability the historical scene of the covenanting tribes. The promise of the country to the fathers, and especially to Abraham, was a divine legitimatization for the conquest of Canaan.

---

[1] Joshua 24.

PART TWO

THE BEGINNING OF ISRAEL'S EXISTENCE: THE COVENANT

PART TWO

THE BEGINNING OF ISRAEL'S EXISTENCE: THE COVENANT

The Covenant in the Mari Letters

> "To my lord say: Thus Ibal-Il, thy servant. The tablet of Ibal-Akad from Aslakka reached me and I went to Aslakka to 'kill an ass' between the Hanu and Idamaras."[1]

In this quotation from the Mari letters the term "kill an ass between..." appears to be a technical term for "to make a treaty " or "to make a covenant", which in Hebrew is qatol 'air.[2] The sacrifice of a young ass "seals" this treaty. The Mari letters are written in Babylonia with many West-Semitic words and terms. The letters reflect in personal names, language, and customs, the time of the patriarchs.[3]

Ibal-Il, apparently a royal officer, regulates the relationship of the people of Hanu with the people of Idamaras through a covenant in which the sacrificial killing of a young ass was essential. This event reminds us of Genesis 15:9,10,17 and Jeremiah 34:18,19. The only difference is that

---

[1] ANET, p. 482.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

the Old Testament the ass was not a sacrificial animal[1] and therefore we find other animals substituted.[2] Ibal-Il says that he went to kill a *hajarum tur atanim* to conclude the covenant. Exactly the same expression is used in Zechariah 9:9, עיר בן־אתנות.[3] The cutting of a sacrificial animal also may explain the use of the term כרת, "to cut a covenant" in Hebrew. כרת seems to have become so much the technical term for the making of a covenant that frequently it alone is used to designate the "cutting" of a covenant, as in 1 Samuel 22:8, 11:2, and 20:16.

The Mari document not only illuminates the usage of the term כרת, but it also can explain the second part of the phrase כרת ברית. For a long time the word *berith* has been a problem to scholars. Commonly it was derived from ברה, to eat,[4] meaning that the communal meal would seal the covenant between the partners.[5] This seems impossible because it would put two different kinds of covenant-making acts in the same phrase, to cut and to eat.

---

[1] Leviticus 11:3; Deuteronomy 14:4ff.

[2] The sacrificial usage of the ass in Mari and perhaps among other Near Eastern people may be the reason for the cultic "uncleanness" of an ass for the Hebrews.

[3] Noth, *Gesammelte Studien*, p. 145.

[4] Rudolf Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (5 vols.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933-42), II, p. 107.

[5] Genesis 31:54; Exodus 24:11.

Noth assumes that the word *berith* has its origin in the phrase כרת ברית.[1] The preposition *birit*, meaning between, would have become an independent adverb. Then it would be possible to assume the phrase *hajarum katalum birit* has the meaning "to kill an ass between". The original meaning of the phrase כרת ברית would have been lost, so that it was necessary to introduce the partners of a covenant with another "between" as in 2 Kings 11:17: כרת ברית בין־בין.

Finally, we have to consider the possibility that the content of the word כרת sheds some light on the original character of the covenant. Do we have a covenant between two equal partners, as it is rendered to us in the old tradition of Genesis 31:44-54, or does a superior conclude a covenant with someone less powerful? Here in the Mari letter we find a third form. An official of the king "cuts" a covenant by killing an ass between two lesser persons. This type of covenant we clearly find in the Old Testament. Joshua makes a covenant between the people and Yahwe, in 2 Kings 11:17 Jehoiada the priest makes a covenant between the people and Yahwe,[2] and in 2 Kings 23:2 King Josiah makes a covenant between Yahwe and the people.

---

[1] Noth, *Gesammelte Studien*, pp. 147-48.

[2] Here in 2 Kings 11:17 we have the interesting phenomenon of the king appearing by himself as a member of the covenant, so that we actually have three members of the covenant. This would be the first time in historical writings

---

that we hear about a covenant in the south which includes Yahwe. But the text as it stands is difficult, and it seems the phrase "between Yahwe and ... " should be regarded as a deuteronomic correction. This is supported by the last part of the sentence which repeats "between the king and the people". This would make sense because the relationship between the house of David and Jerusalem/Judah had been severed under Athaliah and was being restored through this covenant. Noth underlines this thesis by saying that the covenant had been the way David once had gained the kingship over Judah. (Cf. Noth, *Gesammelte Studien*, p. 152.). Noth refers to 2 Samuel 5:3, but he seems to have overlooked that this passage talks about David gaining the kingship over Israel and not over Judah. Nowhere do we have a record of a covenant between David and Judah or Jerusalem. Thus 2 Kings 11:17 really offers a *novum*, or the formulation of the passage is influenced by the Josianic covenant. There are a number of other parallels between Josiah and Jehoash, such as the destruction of the cult places of Baal, the repair of the temple, and the favorable judgment of Deuteronomy.

The Terms of the Covenant:

Berith, Zedekah, Hesed

Berith. The covenant between different Habiru elements is responsible for the existence of Israel. Only the covenant was able to bring these different elements together. The life of Israel in all its facets is determined by the covenantal idea. Through the covenant strangers become blood brothers; in the case of David and Jonathan this relationship even preferred the blood brother over the father.[1] Where there was no biological blood relationship, the covenant stepped in and created a sacred "blood relationship". The constitutive significance of the blood - and this means probably the blood of the animal slain to seal the covenant - is attested in Exodus 24:8 and Zechariah 9:11.[2]

In the Old Testament the covenant meant two things: 1) covenant is the term for a regulated relationship between god and man, and 2) covenant is the term for a half "legal" and half sacred relationship between man and man. This does not mean that there is anything like a secular type of covenant. The covenant between men removed a certain legal insecurity, as in the case of Laban and Jacob.[3] The actual

---

[1] 2 Samuel 19:2f.

[2] Cf. also Deuteronomy 12:23; Leviticus 17:4; Genesis 9:4.

[3] Genesis 31.

enacting of the covenant is a holy act, a sacrifice before god, so that god is involved in the covenant as the guarantor of this covenant.[1]

The legal relationship becomes problematic in its practicability when god is a covenantal partner. God is then a legal person, but that god is a legal person does not mean that the "law" here has lost its immanence.[2] It is also wrong to say that berith originally is always a relationship between two unequal partners where the less powerful partner has to accept a covenant which is imposed upon him by the stronger.[3] The less powerful partner would then be the mere receiver, and all decisions would be made by the stronger.

We do not doubt that there exists such a covenant in our tradition, but it is a late form, and is the P concept of the covenant, as we shall see later.[4] Von Rad himself refers to the J account of the Sinai event as coming close to his interpretation. But the E document clearly contradicts the idea of complete passivity of the less powerful partner; here the human partner has free choice.[5] In the case of the

---

[1] See the above discussion of covenant in the Mari letters.

[2] Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch ..., II, p. 110.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 135.

[4] For P see Genesis 9:1ff. and 17:1ff.

[5] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 137. Exodus 24:9-11(J), and Exodus 24:3-8 (P).

exodus event and the Sinai covenant, Yahwe had already fulfilled his side of the covenant. He had delivered Israel out of Egypt, clearly demonstrating his willingness to fulfill his side of the covenantal obligation: I am your god and you are my people.

If a deity is involved in a covenant as a partner, he is not only the protector of this covenant but he also is subject to this covenant.[1] Therefore a certain interdependency exists between god and human partner. We have every right to assume that the practice of covenanting was alive among the nomads before they entered Canaan because of Genesis 31 and the fact that Baal berith had his sanctuary in a city which had continuous relationships with the fluctuating nomadic elements.[2] The gods of the fathers were tied to persons as Yahwe was tied to Israel. The "strong one of Jacob" was the leader of the Jacob clan, and whatever happened to the clan happened also to the god. What is true for Yahwe

---

[1] Judges 8:33; 9:4; 9:46. Cf. also Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., II, p. 120.

[2] ANET, p. 489 (Amarna letters). Abdu-Heba, king of Jerusalem, writes to Amen-Hotep III (1413-1377) "Or shall we do like Lab'ayu, who gave the land of Shechem to the Apiru?"

ANET, p. 329, footnote 8 (Execration text), which mentions Shechem as ruled by an Asiatic nomad.

ANET, p. 230, cf. the Inscription of Khu-Sebek, about the campaign of Pharaoh Sen-Usert III (c. 1880-1840) against Asiats, among them probably Shechem.

Cf. also Anton Jirku, Altorientalischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Leipzig: A. Deicherstsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Dr. Werner Scholl, 1923), p. 71.

Cf. also the tradition in Genesis 34 and 49, which really tries to explain the scatteredness or non-existence of the "tribe" Simeon and Levi, but may have preserved an old knowledge about early contacts between nomads and Shechem.

has to be said of all the other deities; they live in the lives of their worshippers. It is only later during Israel's history that the prophets recognize Yahwe as being more than an ordinary deity. But it is not accidental that this insight happens together with a modification of the covenant.

We encounter three forms of the covenant in the Old Testament. The first and apparently the oldest is the covenant between people. Sometimes we hear only about the two partners, as in Genesis 31, and sometimes a third person makes a covenant between two other humans, as in 2 Kings 11:17 and in the Mari letter quoted above. The sacrifice which seals the conclusion of a covenant recommends the presence of the deity as the preserver and guarantor of the covenant.

The second form of covenant involves two partners, one of which is Yahwe, as in Joshua 24 and 2 Kings 23, also Exodus 23. The old custom of eating the covenantal sacrifice is here preserved in Exodus 24:5ff., but the divine partner does not himself partake in the eating. The mediator of the covenantal relationship, in this case Moses, partakes in his stead. The third and youngest form is that represented by the Priestly Code, which may be called an election covenant. From the covenant only the form seems to be left, and the obligation is very one-sided, for the human partner is passive. Abraham sleeps while god makes a covenant with him.[1] Connected

---

[1] Genesis 15:12ff. Cf. Kurt Galling, Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1928), p. 35.

with the covenant is the promise of numerous descendants and the possession of the country. The shalom which is the result of the covenant is here understood in a very material sense. Basically shalom means the uninterruptedness, the wholeness of a relationship. Shalom is a quality in the covenantal relationship for which both partners are responsible. In P, shalom is understood very unlegalistically; shalom here is the generous gift of the Lord.

Zedekah.

> "Peace and covenant are... two expressions of the common life of the souls. All life is common life, and so peace and covenant are really denominations of life itself. One is born of a covenant and into a covenant, and wherever one moves in life one makes a covenant or acts on the basis of the already existing covenant."[1]

To live in the state of shalom with Yahwe and other people means nothing else than to practice "righteousness". "Righteousness" is not a forensic term but is rather a relationship term closely related to the covenant. צדקה is the criterion for all relationships in which man can engage. Someone is צדיק when he lives in truth (אמת) with others, that means to be true to the demands which the relationship imposes upon him.[2] The Old Testament proclaims with enthusiasm the צדקה of Yahwe, whose actions are true to the covenant which he made with Israel.[3]

To judge and to do justice in Hebrew never have the forensic connotation they have for our thinking. For the Hebrew those terms mean to keep up צדקה, which was necessary for the self-preservation of the corporate community. Thus צדקה was of the utmost importance for the existence of shalom. Shalom could live only when no covenantal bonds were violated and all members of a covenant lived in zedekah with one another. To do צדקה was to obey the commandments.[4]

---

[1] Johannes Pedersen, Israel, Its Life and Culture (4 vols. in 2; London: Oxford University Press, 1926), I-II, p. 308.

[2] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 369.

[3] Judges 5:11; 1 Samuel 12:7; Micah 6:5; Psalm 103:6; Deuteronomy 33:21; Psalm 129:4f.

[4] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 378.

Hesed. Jonathan shows hesed to David because they had made a covenant with one another.[1] Yahwe is the witness of their covenant, which means that Yahwe watches over the hesed of this covenant. Hesed is the faithfulness of the covenantal partner and is more than just a legal basis for a personal relationship. The covenant between David and Jonathan is concluded because Jonathan loved David.[2] Pedersen may be right in saying that the cloak, equipment, sword, bow and girdle which Jonathan gives to David with the conclusion of their covenant carry with them the nephesh of their owner. David thus partakes in the life (nephesh) of Jonathan.[3]

In the case of the covenant between Yahwe and Israel, hesed means the same, covenantal faithfulness. The divine hesed is shown in Yahwe's protection of Israel. An attack on Israel is an attack on Yahwe. Psalm 136 is the great praise of Yahwe's hesed. All good which he has done for his people he has done because of his hesed.[4] The human hesed, the covenantal faithfulness, consisted in keeping the commandments which Yahwe had given to Israel with the conclusion of the covenant. The commandments here are clearly not to be understood legally, for they are not "law" in a forensic sense,

---

[1] 1 Samuel 20:8.

[2] 1 Samuel 18:4.

[3] Pedersen, op. cit., I-II, p. 23. Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., II, p. 113. Cf. 1 Samuel 18:4.

[4] Cf. also Deuteronomy 32:36.

but are standards of the faithfulness by which the people shall live. When the commandments are broken, the people are faithless. The door is then open for the lie and evil which disrupt all relationship, for relationship means order and security for life. Trust has then left, and death prevails.[1]

The covenant is a relationship with unbreakable solidarity between the partners. The Old Testament sometimes talks about the covenant as a marriage relationship.[2] This seems to be a historization of the Canaanite divine marriage.[3] The prophets use the picture of a marriage covenant mostly in a negative sense, in that the faithlessness of the people is adultery.[4] The one who commits adultery, forsaking his wife and thus forsaking the law of the Lord, the one who does as nations of abominable practices, shall be cut off from people.[5]

---

[1] Ezekiel 20:25f.

[2] Hosea 2:21f.

[3] Johannes Hempel, "Glaube, Mythos und Geschichte im Alten Testament," ZAW, LXV (1953), p. 118.

[4] Leviticus 18:20-21, where adultery is linked with the service of Moloch in the next verse. The predominant interest of the fertility cult was the continuation and renewal of life. Through the rites of sacred marriage the fertility cult "realized" fertility and renewal of life for the future. This of course produced a strong emphasis on the sexual aspects of life. (Cf. Burrows, op. cit., p. 237.) The "natural needs" of Israel made it take part in the fertility cult. Yahwism had to contend with this. The prophets in their proclamation of an exclusive relationship to Yahwe preached Yahwe as the only husband of Israel. The other "marital" connections are pronounced adultery.

The Torah of the Covenant

The tradition of the covenant at Mount Sinai established the bond between Yahwe and the tribes. This tradition originally had its Sitz im Leben in a cultic feast regularly celebrated among the tribes. The tribes understood their existence and their ties with Yahwe as the result of the covenant once concluded at Sinai. The same tradition combines covenant and law. Exodus 19-24 and Deuteronomy 31:11 assume that the proclamation of torah follows the conclusion of the covenant. Exodus 24:3-8 tells us about the ceremony of making the covenant. Sacrificial blood is splashed over the people and the altar (which stands for Yahwe). The people, however, agree to the "conditions" of the covenant before the covenant is concluded.

Every new celebration of this founding event means for Israel a renewal of the old agreement. All members of Israel are made responsible for obedience to the torah of Yahwe, which is the basis of their existence. The event at Sinai and the torah (apodictic law) originally did not belong together. They are inserted into the tradition about the first covenant with Israel. Since they were used in the cultic celebration of the renewal of the covenant as the expression of the same will of Yahwe, it was only consistent

that they use the same wording which had been used in the first covenant.[1] The theological impact of the continued proclamation of the torah kept the Israelites aware that they were different from the inhabitants of Canaan who did not participate in the covenant with Yahwe. This commemoration prevented the Israelites, in contrast to other nations in history, from regarding themselves as autochthon in the country which they inhabited.[2]

According to Joshua 24,[3] the feast of the renewal of the covenant took place at Shechem.[4] Von Rad has reconstructed the liturgical procession of this feast on the

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 329.
Considering the traditions of the covenant we have to differerentiate between historical and existential reality. Since we assume that the covenantal traditions of Israel are connected with Shechem (see section below on "Shechem and the Covenant"), we consider Shechem the historical locus of the covenant. The exodus from Egypt, the encounter with Yahwe through the liberation from slavery, and the experience of the leadership of Yahwe through the desert were understood as the beginning of 'Israel', in other words as the first covenant between Israel and Yahwe. The location of the covenant in the Sinai tradition and the location of the Sinai covenant traditions in the context of the exodus are existential realities, in other words they reflect the self understanding of Israel about her past.

[2] Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 36.

[3] Richard Hentschke, Die Stellung der vorexilischen Schriftpropheten zum Kultus (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957), p. 7. Cf. also Martin Noth, Das System des zwölf Stämme Israels (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930), pp. 66ff. Here Noth says Joshua 24 is the beginning of covenantal Israel.

[4] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 194.

basis of Exodus 19ff. and of Deuteronomy 6:4-28.[1] Without considering the individual problems, the feast proceeded this way: 1) the paraenetic prologue, 2) the proclamation of *torah*, 3) the conclusion of the covenant, and 4) blessing and curse. That our emphasis on the "apologetic" character of *torah* and covenant (the purpose was to distinguish Israel from Canaanites and all other nations) is correct, is suggested by the interpretation of the first commandment which the Old Testament itself gives. Three times the prohibition of serving other gods is based upon Yahwe's jealousy, in Exodus 20:5, 34:14, and Deuteronomy 6:14f. The *torah* prohibits the service (עבדה) of אלהים אחרים.[2]

The covenant between Israel and Yahwe is exclusive. The deliverance from Egypt under Yahwe's guidance not only established Yahwe as the god of Israel, but also excluded the service of other gods.[3] The content of the *torah*, especially the first commandment about the jealousy of Yahwe who will watch over the covenant, documents this exclusiveness. All intercourse with other gods is illicit intercourse. Israel shall not make any covenant with the Canaanites or with their gods.[4] Later the author of

---

[1] Cf. Psalm 50; 81. Von Rad, *Theologie...*, p. 194.

[2] Exodus 20:5; Deuteronomy 5:9; 7:4; 8:19; 11:16; 13:3-13, etc.

[3] The Tannaite midrashim says that the deliverance from Egypt obligated Israel to keep the *torah* of Yahwe. Cf. Curt Lindhagen, *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament* (Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950), p. 153.

[4] Exodus 23:32; 34:12,15; Deuteronomy 7:2; Joshua 23:12, and Judges 2:2.

Deuteronomy even goes so far as to recommend the extermination of the Canaanites in order to remove all possibilities of apostasy.[1]

The Canaanites are not considered as having *torah*. *Torah* is the covenantal will of Yahwe *only*. When the deuteronomic historian wants to speak about the statutes of Canaanites he uses the word חקים.[2] We may conclude that the essential element in the content of the Old Testament *torah* is that which distinguishes it from all other "laws": they proclaim an *exclusive* relationship between Yahwe and Israel. They witness to the will of Yahwe and prevent apostasy. And here the Israelite *torah* points out one difference between Israel and other nations: the history of religion otherwise does not know the concept of apostasy because it does not know the exclusive demand of a covenantal god upon a nation.[3]

---

[1] Deuteronomy 7:16.

[2] 2 Kings 17:8.

[3] Noth, *Gesammelte Studien*, p. 70.

Shechem and the Covenant

It seems that the idea of the covenant was at home in Shechem. The deuteronomic historian renders three different traditions which are all concerned with covenants. The first one is Joshua 24. In spite of the stone which is erected by Joshua at the end of the covenant, Joshua 24 is not to be understood as an aetiological legend.[1] Rather Joshua 24 is the sacred tradition of the sanctuary of Shechem concerning the conclusion of a covenant. The tradition in its present form commands the abolition of the gods as Jacob, their ancestor, had told them. The story continues with a covenant between Yahwe and the people and the proclamation of the _torah_. Joshua 24 does not mention Jacob and leaves the abolition of the gods to Joshua.

According to Alt,[2] the author of Genesis 35:2-4 (E) belongs in the middle monarchical period and probably knows the practices of the cult at Shechem in his era. This would explain also the close relationship between Shechem and Bethel, which at that time was the national cult place of the northern kingdom. The parallelism between Shechem and Bethel goes even further. Both shrines possessed a sacred stone and

---

[1] Martin Noth, _Das Buch Josua_ (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938), p. 108.

[2] Alt, _Kleine Schriften_, I, p. 87. Cf. also Pfeiffer, _Introduction..._, p. 168, and Bentzen, _Introduction..._, II, p. 16.

both had a close tie with the Jacob-Israel traditions.[1]

The god of Shechem is El berith or Baal berith.[2] The group of tribes which belonged to the original core of the later Israel may have been El worshippers in the beginning.[3] Later the sanctuary and city of Shechem belong to the "house Joseph", which consisted of the tribes Ephraim and Manasseh.[4] Whether the "house Joseph" initiated the Yahwe worship at Shechem we do not know. We can say this, however: through their ancestors Jacob and Joseph, the tribes Ephraim and Manasseh are connected with Shechem. The name "Israel" is "intimately bound up with the sanctuary within Manassite territory."[5] Israel as the name of the later northern kingdom is the name of the Shechem amphictyony, Ephraim and Manasseh, to which other elements like Issachar, Asher, and Dan are added later.

The second tradition concerned with a covenant at Shechem is found in 1 Kings 12. Rehoboam, the successor of Solomon, came to Shechem to make a covenant with Israel. Why did Rehoboam go to Shechem? We do not hear anything like this about David or Solomon. At this time the covenantal significance

---

[1] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 304.

[2] Judges 8:33; 9:4,46.

[3] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 130. See also Genesis 33:20, where Jacob erects an altar in the vicinity of Shechem to El, the elohe of Israel.

[4] Joshua 16:5-8.

[5] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 312.

of Shechem must have been still alive. The story says also that Judah had nothing to do with the sanctuary at Shechem and consequently nothing with its covenantal tradition. Under the influence of David's personality, the northern group of tribes which formed the amphictyony at Shechem had accepted his successor as possessing the rightful authority due the heir of King David. But during Solomon's reign the amphictyony already began to be independent. Rebellion grew under the leadership of Jeroboam, and the north soon wanted to regulate their relationship with the new king. They demanded a new treaty, for they were angry about the "galling yoke"[1] which Solomon had imposed upon them. Rehoboam went to Shechem, the 'covenant city', to make a covenant with the north which was to include conditions to ease the burden which Solomon had laid on the north.[2] Rehoboam, however, was not willing to fulfill their covenantal demands, and thus Israel rejected him.

The third tradition, indirectly connected with the covenantal tradition of Shechem, is the Josianic covenant in 2 Kings 23. The Passover feast was celebrated in Jerusalem under Josiah for the first time during the monarchy.[3] The

---

[1] 1 Kings 12:4.

[2] 1 Kings 12:4.

[3] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 339, goes only so far as to say that the Passover was of minor importance in pre-Josianic Jerusalem. This may be true if he means by minor importance that the Passover was not a covenantal feast at Jerusalem.

renewal of the covenant and the covenantal significance of the Passover under Josiah has no basis in any Jerusalemite tradition. Abolishing the foreign gods and the recital of the law are elements familiar to us from Joshua 24. They must have been foreign to the Jerusalem cult,[1] because we never hear of any covenant in the southern kingdom which was according to the Shechem pattern. Josiah took over a Shechem tradition when he made his covenant between Yahwe and the people. We shall see later that he perverted the original idea.

---

[1] E. Nielsen, op. cit., to the contrary.

Covenantal Corporate Solidarity

Society in Israel was not just the sum of members, or a collective as over or against the individual. Individual and collective are concepts foreign to the Israelite, and therefore "society" is not to be understood as something which has to be limited in its power for the protection of the private necessities and wishes of life. "Society" is rather a corporate whole which includes all circles, families, tribes, and their leaders. Outside the corporate whole a man is dead, for he is without rights, powers, and protection. Cain and Esau are examples of outlaws who were doomed to perish unless a deity took care of them.[1]

The covenant was the power which created and established "Israel" as a corporate people. The law of this covenant kept the corporate functioning and alive. Yahwe was a member of the covenant and thus of the corporate; he stood behind the covenantal law and his will dominated and guided the various nomadic elements. Yahwe himself is subject to the covenant in so far as he fulfills his covenantal responsibilities. It is his zedekah that he stands over Israel and protects it. The Song of Deborah[2] praises the covenantal faithfulness of Yahwe. His saving actions in

---

[1] Genesis 12:1ff.; 15:1ff.; Job 30:1-8.

[2] Judges 5.

history are צדקות יהוה.[1]

The exodus from Egypt was a corporate experience. We do not know how many of the later tribes partook in this exodus, but all of them understood it as the founding event of *their* covenant with Yahwe. Actions which we consider individual in nature have their roots in the corporate whole and have their purpose in the corporate whole, which includes all members of the covenant with Yahwe. When David does not take advantage of Saul's vulnerable situation he acts in *zedekah*.[2] The welfare of the whole demanded "righteousness" and righteous actions in faithfulness to the corporate whole. The *kabod* of a man or the *kabod* of Yahwe have their origin in being governed according to the covenental *zedekah*. Actions against the covenantal *zedekah* would destroy the one who performed them and would destroy also the corporate whole.

> "If everything that comes under the term covenant were dissolved, existence would fall to pieces, because no soul can live an isolated life. It not only means that it cannot be without the assistance of others; it is in direct conflict with its essence to be something apart. It can only exist as a link of the whole... The annihilation of the covenant would not only be the ruin of society, but the dissolution of each individual soul."[3]

---

[1] Judges 5:11; Micah 6:5; Psalm 48:11f.; 103:6; Daniel 9:16; Deuteronomy 33:21.

[2] 1 Samuel 26:23.

[3] Pedersen, *op. cit.*, I-II, p. 308.

The covenant with Yahwe which constituted the corporate Israel was a reality for all Israelites. The everyday events of daily life as well as events of national dimension were related to Yahwe and Israel's relationship to him. After the settlement in Canaan all salvatory events in Israel's history were re-enacted by the cult; thus their reality and impact upon the people were preserved. What had been originally the personal experience of individual nomadic elements had become the corporate property of Israel. What Yahwe had done to some of them had happened to all of them. The means of expression of the cult were manifold and the celebration of great historic festivals like the Passover was not just a commemoration, but the real event happened again, thus insuring the people of the presence of Yahwe, who protected and guided the people for the sake of his zedekah and kabod.

The ark was the symbol of the presence of Yahwe and was the leader of the covenantal militia in the holy war. Where the ark was, there also was the cultic center of the tribes. Just as Yahwe was not confined to any particular place, so also the ark was able to wander from one sanctuary to another. Yahwe was regarded as present with the ark. Yahwe was the foremost representative of the corporate Israel. In Yahwe, Israel had its identity, which distinguished it from other nations. There was no need for a person to represent Yahwe, as the Judaic king did in later times. The ark was leader, was Emmanuel, which meant Yahwe present among his

people.

The wholeness and the shalom of the corporate Israel had its center in Yahwe. As the father represents the whole house, which means all souls in his property, thus Yahwe represented the whole corporate Israel; Israel was his property, his people, and his house. The essence of the corporate welfare was the mutual zedekah relationship between Yahwe and Israel. The zedekah of Israel had its origin in the zedekah of Yahwe. In the virtue of his zedekah Yahwe maintained the whole by maintaining the covenant upon which the corporate was founded.[1]

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, pp. 300-301.

Israel is the Property of Yahwe

Through the covenant concluded at Mount Sinai, the "book of the covenant",[1] the blood of the covenant,[2] and the commandments,[3] the basis of the future relationship between Yahwe and Israel is established. The key passage is Exodus 19:5-6:

> "If you... keep my covenant, you shall be my very own out of all peoples, and you shall be a kingdom of priests to me and a holy nation."

Yahwe is Israel's god and Israel is Yahwe's property. Together with "holy nation" we find the idea that Israel is Yahwe's property.[4] Canaan was considered the heritage of Yahwe.[5] These ideas were probably very old in Israel.[6] Canaan was identified with the cultic realm belonging to Yahwe. If anyone were outside its borders he was "far from the face of Yahwe".[7] To belong to Yahwe meant as much as to "share in the Lord".[8] That Yahwe and Israel belong together

---

[1] Exodus 19ff.

[2] Exodus 24:8.

[3] Exodus 34:27f.

[4] Exodus 19:5; Psalm 135:4, segulla. Exodus 34:9 nachala (verb); 1 Kings 8:51,53, in Deuteronomy and the prophets. See Galling, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[5] Exodus 15:17; 1 Samuel 26:19; 2 Samuel 14:16; Jeremiah 2:7, etc.

[6] Von Rad, *Theologie...*, pp. 70-71.

[7] 1 Samuel 16:20. Cf. von Rad, *Theologie...*, pp. 70f.

[8] Joshua 22:25.

is also expressed by using the possessive pronoun, "the Lord our God".[1]

The term "holy nation" appears in a pre-deuteronomic text only once, perhaps twice, Exodus 19:5, and 22:30.[2] "Holy nation" and the "property out of all peoples" correspond to one another. "Holy" is not an ethical or religious quality but is a covenantal term. "Holy" is a characteristic of Yahwe and therefore Israel, being the property of the holy Yahwe, becomes a holy nation. This idea undoubtedly is as old as the amphictyony itself. We assumed that the covenant was something the nomads already practiced, therefore we have to make a chronological distinction between covenant and the rise of the term "holy nation". Canaan, as the dwelling place

---

[1] Exodus 5:3; 6:7; 10:8; 15:2; 20:2; Deuteronomy 4:3, etc.

[2] Cf. Johannes Hempel, Das Ethos des Alten Testamentes (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1938), p. 81. Hempel doubts the pre-deuteronomic value of both texts; Exodus 19:5f. is related to Deuteronomy 7:6. The same is true for Exodus 22:30 and Deuteronomy 14:21. The question is whether the idea of the "holy nation" has to be deuteronomistic or whether it can be explained out of pre-deuteronomistic situations. It is well known that Deuteronomy is very much a collection of older materials which do not necessarily have their origin in the time of Deuteronomy. The idea of the "holy nation" seems to be a covenantal idea, which means that the "holy nation" is something resulting from the covenant. We discussed the "jealousy" of Yahwe in his relationship to Israel. We have also seen that the purpose of the covenant seemed to be to distinguish Israel in its relationship to Yahwe and its separation from the surrounding nations. Therefore we have to judge Exodus 19:5f. and 22:30 as pre-deuteronomic as much as the covenant is pre-deuteronomic.

Cf. also the use of the title "Holy One of Israel" in Isaiah. This title corresponds to the title "holy nation", especially when Isaiah presents the holiness of Yahwe in contrast to the unholiness of Israel (Isaiah 1:4; 5:18ff.; 5:24; 6:3ff.). Here we find a negative description of Israel, the holy nation.

of Israel, was the property of Yahwe. One may also say that all of Canaan was one large cult place.[1] The terms "holy nation" and "property of Yahwe" are designed to emphasize the difference between Israel and the people of the country or the surrounding countries.[2] Israel was something particular.

As far as we know, the "holy nation" in an ideal sense never became a reality, for Israel had to adjust to the surrounding nations, but the idea was strong enough to make Israel a stranger among the nations. Israel's essence was separated from the essence of other nations because in Israel's history we meet phenomena for which we have no comparison.[3] The eschatological factor, sera kadosh,[4] has its counterpart in the "holy nation" of the beginning. The end of time and the beginning touch one another here.

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 298.

[2] Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., I, p. 88. The root קד is probably not Hebrew but of Canaanite origin. The meaning of the old חרם which originally may have filled the place of קדוש changed into "banished" and received a negative connotation. The root family קד means "to separate", that which is separated from the secular realm. The opposite is חל (see 1 Samuel 21:5f.; Ezekiel 22:26; 42:20; 44:22f.). Closest to קדוש in meaning is טהר, "clean". However, קדוש is a cultic term while טהר is a ritual term. It is important to note that קדוש always owns an energy which טהר lacks. According to the Old Testament, "holy" means that which is through cult and ritual set apart for the service of Yahwe.

[3] Noth, Geschichte Israels, p. 11.

[4] Isaiah 6:13.

Bachar and Berith 'olam

Bachar, to elect, is used many times in secular and religious relationships. We find the term meaning Yahwe's election of Israel, particularly when it denotes a certain theological content. The motive of election is emphasized, which is Yahwe's love for Israel. Israel has no intrinsic value for the sake of which Yahwe could have elected it.[1]

"To choose the things that Yahwe delights in"[2] is identical with "to keep the covenant", which means that bachar is here a term of commitment.[3] Accordingly, bachar

---

[1] The idea that Israel had no value in itself seems to be late, for it assumes the long history of apostasy and Israel's neglect of Yahwe's will. It is the work of Deuteronomy which advances the bachar relationship between Yahwe and Israel as grace relationship. For Deuteronomy the only value of Israel was that it was chosen. With the deuteronomic adoption of the bachar of the Jerusalem king for Israel and the simultaneous Yahwistic limitation of the kingship in Deuteronomy, a development begins which ends with the servant in Deutero-Isaiah. Deuteronomy changes the individual character of bachar, making it relevant for the whole Israel. Deutero-Isaiah takes one step backward from the whole Israel to the remnant as the servant. He adopts the individual features of the Jerusalem king (chosen, servant, messiah), to characterize the servant. Both entities, Israel in Deuteronomy and the servant in Deutero-Isaiah, are commissioned through their relationship to Yahwe. Deuteronomy, being strongly connected with torah and Yahwistic past, formulates the commission of Israel in terms of the holy war. Deutero-Isaiah, as a prophet, facing the historical events of past and present, formulates the commission of the servant as symbol of Yahwe's glory among the nations.

Cf. Theodore C. Vriezen, Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1953), p. 41.

[2] Isaiah 56:4.

[3] Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbush..., IV, p. 153.

is used in the older text Joshua 24:22 with the meaning "to confess". Here the Israelites confess themselves to Yahwe. The covenant is an act of will by the people. Yahwe chooses them and they choose Yahwe. Perhaps Joshua 24:22 is technical terminology of a legal treaty, especially as it is in the royal law.[1]

Usually the use of bachar, meaning the particular relationship of Yahwe to Israel, is considered a theistic term. Its use for the election of the Judaic king and for Jerusalem seems to be older. Actually, bachar is used only for the election of an individual such as the king or a priest. It is not used for the vocation of the prophets, which may indicate that it has an official connotation, that is, to choose for official service. Vriezen thinks that the term bachar as used for the election of Jerusalem and the temple is a theistic creation, and connects it with Josiah's limitation of all cultic service to the Jerusalem temple.[2] But we have to be careful. In Deuteronomy the sanctuary is elected, but it is not specifically named. That the temple in Jerusalem was the elected sanctuary was an arbitrary assumption of Josiah. We will see later that the relationship between Deuteronomy and Josiah is at least problematic.

---

[1] Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., IV, p. 154.

[2] Vriezen, op. cit., p. 46.

The election of the king by Yahwe is a popular idea.[1] However, we have to refute the generalization of Kittel, that this idea was popular in Israel and Judah. We never hear about the election of a north Israelite king through Yahwe. If bachar as a technical term for the election of Israel is pre-deuteronomic, it must have its origin in Jerusalem. We note an interesting change in the covenantal idea. For the south we will have to talk about a bachar covenant. We heard that the king was elected by Yahwe. In the south the king was the incarnation of the corporate whole. Bachar was used for the election of individuals. Thus through the election of the king, all Judah partook in this election. The people do not seem close to Yahwe, for they have a mediator in the king.[2]

When we hear in the Old Testament about the election of Israel we will have either the theology or the influence of Deuteronomy. The bachar theology was of Jerusalemic origin, and never became the common property of all Israel. In Deuteronomy, a northern work, the bachar theology was changed accordingly. The election of Israel is based upon the exodus from Egypt, which means upon the very event which constituted the covenantal relationship between Yahwe and Israel. Deuteronomy understands obedience toward the torah

---

[1] Saul: 1 Samuel 10:24; 2 Samuel 21:6. David: 1 Samuel 16:8,9,10; cf. also 1 Kings 8:16 and 2 Samuel 16:18.

[2] Refer to the section following, concerning the monarchy.

as the essence of this election.[1] In comparison to the old covenant the election covenant developed a more legalistic attitude where the *torah* was concerned.

Deuteronomy, which was of northern origin and which knew the covenantal traditions of the north, knew also the prophetic proclamations about the sinfulness of the people who, trusting in the *zedekah* of Yahwe and the salvation offered them by their cult, repudiated the very essence of the relationship between Yahwe and themselves. The prophetic message of doom presupposes the end of the covenant in its old form. For them the covenant was not a *berith 'olam*.

The use of the word *bachar* in the Psalms attests the connection of *bachar* and *berith 'olam*. In Psalm 105:6 the descendants of the fathers are chosen; in v. 7 we find the reference to the *berith 'olam* (v.9 and v.10), and v. 11 follows with the promise of Canaan as Israel's *nachala*, heritage. The same situation is present in vv. 42-43. Verse 26 combines election with being Yahwe's servant.[2] In Psalm 78 the election is not the basis but is the climax of the history of salvation.[4] Judah, Mount Zion, and David

---

[1] Klaus Koch, "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel," *ZAW*, LXVII (1955), p. 224.

[2] Cf. Psalm 135:4,5,1,14; only the combination *bachar* with *ebed* is missing.

[3] Cf. also Psalm 33:12.

[4] Koch, *ZAW*, LXVII (1955), p. 209.

are chosen, but not Jacob. David is the servant.[1] The bachar includes the berith 'olam.[2] The election of David and the election of Mount Zion go hand in hand;[3] both are "forever". We meet this theological concept already in pre-deuteronomic southern literature.[4] The covenant is of quite a different character. 2 Samuel 23:1-7 represents a genuine Jerusalemite tradition when it says that Yahwe had made an everlasting covenant with David.

The P code presents a clear picture of the character of berith 'olam. The term is not used in a secular realm but is limited to the history of salvation. Berith 'olam may almost be called "institution of salvation"[5] which is

---

[1] The mention of Jacob in this Psalm which probably is directed against the northern kingdom (cf. Koch, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 209) is puzzling. But the fathers were chosen by Yahwe only in the Psalms, and of a covenant between Yahwe and the fathers Genesis knows nothing, only about a covenant between Yahwe and Abraham in Genesis 17. We probably have to assume that the traditions about the fathers assimilated, although the Jacob tradition will belong to the north and the Abraham tradition to the south. The assimilation may have been a popular one and was made easier through the tradition according to which Jacob as well as Abraham received the promise of inheritance of the country (Genesis 35:11f. and 17:4ff.). But the mention of Jacob in Psalm 78 explains itself much more easily out of the character of this Psalm. Directed against the northern kingdom, it seeks to legitimate the superiority of Judah as the really chosen one of Yahwe, because the north forsook Yahwe's cause and broke the covenant with him. Thus Psalm 78 reflects the common southern attitude which regarded the break with the Davidic dynasty the major crime of the north.

[2] Psalm 105:6-10.

[3] Psalm 132:13. Cf. also E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 340.

[4] E. Nielsen, op. cit.

[5] Walter Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testamentes (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1939).

not dependent upon the attitude and action of man.[1] This means that the old "legal agreement" which was the basic nature of the covenant[2] has been surrendered and is substituted with a grace relationship between Yahwe and his people.

---

[1] Genesis 9:16; 17:7; 31:16; Leviticus 24:8; Numbers 18:19.

[2] See the previous section on the covenant.

The New Covenant

For the prophets and for Deuteronomy the history of the two kingdoms had been a history of constantly forsaking Yahwe. The reaction of the prophets was the preaching of Yahwe's punishment. Because the people had not acted according to the exclusiveness demanded in their relationship with Yahwe, Yahwe annulled his covenant with them through great political catastrophies.[1] After this failure of the Sinai covenant Yahwe created a new covenant (ברית חדושׁ).[2] This new covenant is not something which has its roots in the tradition, but is something completely new. All preaching of a new covenant must be considered an absolute contrast to a berith 'olam. If the berith 'olam would still have been a reality, no new covenant would have been necessary.

We have to oppose Mowinckel, who interprets the new covenant as the renewal of the old "covenant" once concluded with David.[3] Furthermore, this new covenant cannot be explained out of the throne ascension feast. It may be true that the throne ascension day celebrates the repetition of the exodus from Egypt and the Sinai covenant, but this renewal of the covenant concerns the "covenant" with David, which is the

---

[1] Hosea 6:7; 8:1; 1:9; Isaiah 2:6; Jeremiah 11:1-3.

[2] Jeremiah 31:31ff.; cf. also 32:38ff.; Ezekiel 11:19f,; 36:25f.

[3] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 288.

berith 'olam.[1] Jeremiah 31:31ff., the classic text for the new covenant, emphasizes the newness of this covenant. With the downfall of the monarchy in 587 B.C., the throne ascension feast would have been meaningless. The berith 'olam had proven itself an irony. Something completely new was demanded. The new covenant was with Judah and Israel. The covenantal torah will not be taught any more by men to men, but Yahwe will put his law into their hearts.[2] Thus the ideal will be achieved; Yahwe will be Israel's god and Israel will be Yahwe's people. The quality of the new covenant is that Yahwe, himself, will teach torah, men will know (ידע is a verb of intense relationship) torah. We find this idea also in Ezekiel, who talks about a future covenant.[3]

The problem we face is the relationship between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. Deuteronomy proposed a new kind of covenant too, as we have seen. Does Jeremiah despair of Deuteronomy as a force of salvation? We do not hear anything like a rejection of Deuteronomy in Jeremiah,[4] but we must assume that Jeremiah thought the bachar covenant concept of Deuteronomy was insufficient. Deuteronomy still reckoned

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 282, to the contrary.

[2] Jeremiah 31:33.

[3] Ezekiel 37:26 and 36:26f. Cf. also Gunnar Østborn, Tōrā in the Old Testament, A Semantic Study (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1945), p. 151.

[4] See the discussion below regarding Jeremiah 8:8 and 11:1-14 in the section on Deuteronomy and the prophets.

with the monarchy as an intact institution. This apparently justified its proposal of the bachar covenant. But the events of 609-587 B.C. must have destroyed the possibility for Jeremiah that Yahwe had chosen this nation. The only way out for him was something entirely new, something which was entirely different from the covenant at Sinai.[1] The old is past; something new will be created by Yahwe: a new exodus, a new covenant, a new Moses.[2]

---

[1] Jeremiah 31:32.

[2] Isaiah 43:16-20; Jeremiah 31:31ff.; Hosea 2:16ff.

PART THREE

THE THREE MAIN FORMING FORCES IN ISRAEL'S PRE-EXILIC LIFE

CHAPTER I

THE LEVITES

CHAPTER I

THE LEVITES

The Levitical Priesthood

The early history of what are later called "the Levites" lies in the dark. In the traditional order of the tribes, Levi appears together with Simeon among the first four. According to Genesis 34, Simeon and Levi must have had some connection with the city of Shechem, but the meaning of this tradition is now lost. Here Simeon and Levi are not even tribes, but individuals, and the story may reflect a later situation in which the tribes are involved. Later the "house Joseph" occupies the region around Shechem. Simeon and Levi are cursed to be scattered among the tribes.[1] The distribution of the country does not provide the Levites with a share, except for some cities to live in.[2] One theory says that the conflict with Shechem paralyzed Simeon and Levi, thus making the invasion and occupation of their land possible for the "house Joseph". But this theory stands in contrast to

---

[1] Genesis 34 and 49.

[2] Joshua 14:4. This reflects the situation of Deuteronomy, as we shall see later.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The early history of [illegible]

Levites [illegible]

[illegible]

ture. According to [illegible]

has come down [illegible]

of this [illegible]

ever before, [illegible]

Levite situation in which the [illegible]

These Levites occupied the [illegible]

and land are given to be [illegible]

distribution of the country [illegible]

a share, except for [illegible]

says that the conflict with [illegible]

that marked the invasion [illegible]

for the [illegible]

---

[1] Genesis 34, [illegible]

[2] Joshua 21. [illegible] distribution of [illegible] to be shall [illegible]

Genesis 34, which clearly states the success of Simeon and Levi in their conflict with Shechem. The question is whether the Levites ever had been a tribe. Their tribal character is attested without any doubt only in Genesis 49.

Aaron and Moses were said to be Levites.[1] It is Meek's thesis that only the Levites were in Egypt. He supports this with the appearance of Egyptian names among the Levites: Moses, Assir, Pashur, Hophni, Phinehas, Merari, Putiel, etc.[2] But we have to consider the historical value of the Joseph tradition, which makes it probable that at least some nomadic elements which later form the "house Joseph" had been in Egypt. It follows that if we assume the presence of Joseph and Levi in Egypt we must also assume that Levi originally had been one of the fore-mentioned nomadic elements, a fact which seems highly probable in the light of the tradition.

We also should consider the rule of the sanctuary at Kadesh, which may be of importance for our problem. C.A. Simpson thinks that it was "at Kadesh, that the relation in which Israel stood to Yahweh received through Moses a new and richer significance."[3] Although we do not agree with Simpson

---

[1] Exodus 2:1; 6:20; Numbers 26:59.

[2] Meek, _op_. _cit_., p. 32ff. Cf. also Noth, _Die israelitischen Personennamen..._, p. 63.

[3] Cuthbert Aikman Simpson, _The Early Traditions of Israel_ (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), p. 419.

in his assumption that the Joseph tribes were no part of the Kadesh group, because the tradition tells about their conquest of Canaan from the east, we accept the importance which Simpson has given to Kadesh.

Judges 11:16,17 puts into the mouth of Jephthah an account of the migration of the Israelites coming from Egypt, which seems to have some knowledge of the actual events. Joshua 15:3 gives the same event in quite a different fashion. Here we are told of military conquest, while in Judges we hear that the fugitives from Egypt evade the threat of military conflict with the kings of Edom and Moab.[1] Since it is generally agreed that we have to assume a gradual and non-violent invasion of the tribes into Canaan (with some exceptions) the Judges account seems even more probable. Here we are told about the tribes coming out of Egypt and going straight to Kadesh. After having tried to get free passage through the land of the Edomites and Moabites, they stay at Kadesh for a while. Finally they continue their migration around the danger spots, coming to the Arnon River in the east of Canaan.

It is our theory that Kadesh was the center of the worship of Yahwe. When the Joseph tribes came out of Egypt they "established themselves at Kadesh. Miriam died there and was buried there."[2] Here it was that the people revolted

---

[1] Numbers 24.

[2] Numbers 20:1 (E). Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 171. Cf. for the critical problem of the passage H. Holzinger, Numeri (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1903), pp. 83f.

against Moses (and Aaron), and here, we propose, the Levites subdued this revolution in the name of Yahwe.[1]

Unfortunately the etymology of "Levite" is not certain. Gray gives a survey of the etymological possibilities.[2] It was thought that the inscriptions found in El-Ola could help determine the etymology and the original meaning of "Levite", but we have to be cautious in the evaluation of the El-Ola inscriptions. The identification of the Minaean and the Hebrew terms is doubtful. In Minaean the root is clearly לוא, but we cannot say the same of the Hebrew root. In spite of the etymological differences and difficulties we have to admit some resemblance: Hebrew lewi and Minaean lawi both designate cult officials. It is important that the term lewi is not found in the Minaean inscriptions in the homeland in Southern Arabia.[3] The term therefore must

---

[1] Exodus 32:22ff. Historically the hostility of the Yahwist Levites against bull worship is a Canaanite feature which cannot have taken place during the exodus. (Cf. E. Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 275-76.) The Sinai event itself is historically doubtful. Not only the location of the mountain is unknown, but it is also probable that Mount Sinai is a Canaanite feature. Yahwe originally had not been known as a mountain god, but Baal always had been. This fact is supported by the location of the Sinai tradition in later Israel; it was located in Jerusalem, where the idea of Yahwe enthroned on a mountain was popular and was expounded until Zion as the dwelling place of Yahwe emerged. To be sure, the Sinai tradition is older than the Zion tradition and Yahwe is not thought of as dwelling on Sinai, but this may be due to the fact that at the time of the formation of the Sinai tradition one still was acquainted with Yahwe's true character.

[2] Gray, op. cit., pp. 243ff.

[3] Ibid., p. 244.

be limited to El-Ola and may not be a native Minaean word.

Another difficulty is the dating of the inscriptions of El-Ola. Scholars vary from 1500 B.C. to 700 B.C., so that we cannot assure with any certainty the usage of the term at El-Ola during the exodus. But still two theories stand: 1) that the Hebrews borrowed the term from the Minaeans, or 2) that the Minaeans of El-Ola borrowed the term from the Hebrews.[1] The second suggestion seems more probable, because the term does not appear in any text from the Minaean homeland.

Another hypothesis which offers itself is that "Levi" and"Yahwe" are of the same origin.[2] The name Yahwe cannot be explained. Its origin is unknown. We know that it is not a Minaean name because the names of the Minaean gods are known to us,[3] and there is no trace of the name Yahwe. In Exodus 32 we encounter the fierce Yahwism of the Levites, who take to the sword to defend the purity of the worship of Yahwe. They defend against the golden bull, which means that the source knows about the strong Yahwism of the Levites in Canaan. But where is the source of this kind of Yahwism? Why do the Levites above all others feel compelled to fight for their god? The answer which offers itself is that Yahwe was their god, and may have been their god from the very

---

[1] Gray, op. cit., p. 244.

[2] Ibid., p. 252, against Gray's statements.

[3] Ibid., p. 253.

beginning.

The hypothetical result of this discussion may be summed up. Kadesh was an oasis, perhaps a caravan center. The god worshipped there was Yahwe, a deity of the nomads. Yahwe's priesthood were the Levites. The Joseph tribes, coming from Egypt, lived there for a while. They brought with them their experiences in Egypt, the miracle of delivery, and when they continued their search for land the Levites joined them and became the priests of "Joseph".[1] They named the god who had done great things for the fugitives from Egypt. They entered Canaan from the east[2] with the "house Joseph". Finally we must say that "Levite" does not denote "priest" in general, but signifies a particular kind of priest, a priest such as the nomads needed, a nomadic priest.[3]

---

[1] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 274. Here Nielsen refutes the idea that there was any close connection between Levi and Judah. Close connections to northern tribes are much more obvious: Dan, Shechem, Ephraim (cf. Deuteronomy 33).

[2] Judges 11:16f.

[3] Refer to what is said below concerning the ark.

The Levites are Chosen by Yahwe

Apart from the election of the Levites in Deuteronomy,[1] we find this election in Exodus 32:26-29 and Numbers 3; 8; and 18:1ff. In Numbers 3 the "tribe" Levi is elected to serve Aaron and his sons as some kind of clerus minor. The idea of the tribe Levi, however, is refuted in the same chapter. Yahwe takes the Levites as a substitute for the firstborn of all Israelites. "...at the time that I slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, I consecrated to myself all the first-born in Israel."[2] This passage reflects the victory of the Aaronites. This victory was achieved after some struggle. For this conflict we have contrasting traditions: in Numbers 16 the Korahites, a Levite clan, rebel against Aaron and Moses. The rebellion ends with the destruction of the rebels. In Exodus 32:12ff. Aaron initiates bull worship among the Israelites. Moses, with the help of the Levites, extinguishes the apostasy. This tradition shows a favorable attitude towards the Levites and criticizes the Aaronite priesthood.[3]

---

[1] Deuteronomy 10:8f.

[2] Numbers 3:13.

[3] Usually this tradition is said to refer to the establishment of bull worship at Dan and Bethel. This theory is supported by a comparison of Exodus 32:8 with 2 Kings 12:28, and Exodus 32:26-29 with 1 Kings 12:31 (cf. E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 276). Nielsen points out that if this theory is accepted, the presence of Aaron would be difficult to explain

We think that this tradition presents a true picture of the time during the beginning of the monarchy, when the fight for supremacy and priestly authority between the clergy of the temple in Jerusalem and the Levites took place. In old times the priesthood was the right of the Levites. The old tradition of Judges 17[1] says explicitly that at that time only a Levite was desirable as a priest. The story mentions the presence of priests other than Levites, but it also indicates that Micah did not hesitate a moment when he had the oportunity to acquire a Levitical priest.[2] The Levites seem to have extraordinary power because Micah considers the acquiry of the Levite a great asset.[3]

Yahwe had elected the heros eponymos of the Levites.[4]

---

because Aaron is connected neither with Bethel nor with Dan. Nielsen suggests then that since the priesthood at Dan was Levitic (Judges 17f.) we have to look for another explanation. Aaron stands for the Jerusalemite priesthood in a majority of Old Testament texts (E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 277) and we have some evidence for bull worship at the temple in Jerusalem (1 Kings 7:23-26); also, in 1 Kings 12 it is said that Jeroboam's establishment of bull worship in Dan and Bethel was an imitation of the cult in Jerusalem. That the traditions about the Levites reflect conflicts with the Jerusalemite higher clergy is suggested by Pedersen, op. cit., I-II, p. 19. Pedersen locates the conflict in the post-exilic temple, because Korah is well known as the name of a part of the Levitical priesthood at that time.

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 243.

[2] Judges 17:5,10.

[3] Judges 17:13.

[4] 1 Samuel 2:28; Psalm 65:5; 105:26.

The particular relationship between Yahwe and the Levites is signified by the phrase "Yahwe is my part (portion)", as von Rad has pointed out.[1] In Psalm 73:26 we find that old phrase which was handed down through the generations. It told about a relationship for life with Yahwe, and one which could not be lost.[2] This phrase was a Levitical one and appears already in 2 Kings 18:37 and 22:4.[3] It corresponds well with Exodus 32, where the Levites proved that Yahwe was their portion.

The Levites could be called a priestly order.[4] As we have suggested, they were never a tribe. This fact is supported by the legend that they are the substitute for the sacrifice of the firstborn. They lived throughout all Israel as an order, accepting members out of all tribes which "inherited" the Levitical qualities of a close relationship to Yahwe. Besides bearing the curse the Levites receive "blessing" giving them the _thummin_ and _urim_.[5] They lived because Yahwe "filled their hands"[6], and received the tenth

---

[1] Von Rad, _Theologie..._, p. 402.

[2] _Ibid._

[3] Note the name Hilkiah, which means "Yahwe is my part".

[4] Hempel, _Das Ethos..._, p. 76.

[5] Deuteronomy 33:8ff. Cf. Hempel, _Das Ethos..._, p. 76. Cf. also Genesis 49:5ff.

[6] This is a technical term for the installment of a Levitical priest.

for their living.[1] Their strongest legitimation was their covenant with Yahwe in Numbers 25:10ff.[2]

---

[1] Judges 17:12; 1 Kings 13:33; Exodus 28:41.

[2] Aaron is mentioned in this covenant as a member of the Levitical order, but a critical analysis will show that Aaron was a secondary addition, in fact Eleazar was already an Aaronite addition (cf. K. Möhlenbrink, "Die levitische Überlieferung des Alten Testaments," *ZAW*, LII (1934), p. 220.). Aaron is not even mentioned in Numbers 31:6; Joshua 22:13; 22:31,32, only Eleazar; we have to prefer the tradition of 1 Samuel 1:3; 2:34, etc. for historical reasons. Here the father of Phinehas is not Eleazar but Eli, the priest of the ark at Shiloh.

The Levites and the Holy War

In the book of Numbers the tasks of the Levites are described. Their duty is to take care of the ark, especially when the ark is on the move;[1] Therefore, "bearing" could be called a Levitical עבד.[2] Usually the terms which are used to designate the service of the Levites are also applied to military service. Moses enlists (פקד) the Levites upon the command of Yahwe.[3] Another significant term for the military-like service of the Levites is צבא, a term denoting active service.[4] Lindhagen therefore suggests that the Levites have been a militia sacra.[5]

Yahwe was a god of war, and the ark was moved into the holy war as the symbol of Yahwe's presence with the covenantal militia.[6] The ark, carried by the Levites,

---

[1] Numbers 3:8-36; 4:4-49; 7:5-9. Cf. Lindhagen, op. cit., p. 111.

[2] Numbers 7:10-49; 1:50ff.; 4:15. Sometimes the ark went on an ox wagon, as in Numbers 7:7f.

[3] Numbers 3:15-39; 4:23ff.

[4] Lindhagen, op. cit., p. 115.

[5] Ibid., p. 116.

[6] One is inevitably reminded of the otfe of the Bedouins as described by Julian Morgenstern, The Ark, the Ephod, and the "Tent of Meeting" (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1945), pp. 5ff. The otfe is a symbol of god for the Arabs. They carry it into battle, sometimes with a maiden sitting on the otfe or accompanying it. The maiden is usually a virgin and

marched in the middle of the army.[1] Until the time of David, the ark was carried into battles in which the covenantal militia was involved. The ark participated in the campaign against the Ammonites as we hear in the story of Uriah:

> "The ark and Israel and Judah dwell in booths, and my master Joab and the servants of my lord are encamping in the open field ... and should I enter my house to eat and drink and lie with my wife...?"[2]

The warriors participating in a campaign of the ark, which means in a holy war, had to undergo certain ritual exercises; they were not to eat any food before the battle,[3] and the booty made in a holy war was the property of Yahwe.[4] Von Rad has dedicated some learned studies to the phenomenon

---

preferably the daughter of the sheik. The maiden chooses one of the men of the tribe (the strongest and ablest one) to lead the army into battle. He himself guides the camel upon which the otfe is mounted into the hottest points of the battle and all the brave men of the tribe rally around it to defend it. To lose the otfe means to lose not only the battle but also to lose the god present on the otfe. This reminds us of the story of Deborah and Barak. Deborah was such a battle maiden, inspiring the hearts of the men with ecstatic songs (cf. Judges 4; 5). Although we do not hear about the fight against Sisera as a holy war, we may assume that it was, since more than one tribe participated. The special care of the Levites for the ark, and the military terms used for their service, may indicate that the Levites were the bodyguard of the ark and at the same time (through their relationship to the deity of the ark) mediators of the divine will.

[1] Numbers 10:21.

[2] 2 Samuel 11:11.

[3] 1 Samuel 14: 24, 28.

[4] 1 Samuel 15:19. Cf. also Deuteronomy 7:16-26.

of the holy war and its rituals.[1] The holy war was initiated or proclaimed through the sounding of the shophar and the sending of pieces of meat to the tribes of Israel.[2] Here we find a very ancient custom, which proclaimed through such drastic actions the urgency of the situation in which the amphictyony found itself.

The militia of the tribes was gathered in a camp. This camp was a cult place, and the militia was called עם יהוה; עם האלהים.[3] Accordingly, the men in the camp consecrated themselves to Yahwe, who was going to act wonders through them.[4] Sacrifices were offered before the battle.[5] Yahwe was consulted through the Levites.[6] It is characteristic of the holy war that all initiative and action depended on Yahwe. The men were almost unnecessary. Yahwe gave the enemies into the hands of his people.[7] Yahwe was present with the ark and led his army.[8] The relative

---

[1] Gerhard von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1951), pp. 6ff.

[2] Judges 6:34f.; 3:27; 1 Samuel 13:3; Judges 19:29f.

[3] Judges 5:11,13; 20:2; 1 Samuel 1:12.

[4] Joshua 3:5.

[5] 1 Samuel 7:9; 13:9f.

[6] Judges 20:23, 27; 1 Samuel 7:9; 14:8ff.

[7] Joshua 2:24; 6:2; 6:16; 8:1; Judges 3:28; 4:7; 7:9, etc.

[8] Judges 4:14; 2 Samuel 5:24; Joshua 3:11. Cf. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg..., p. 28. In the classic time of the holy wars the ark probably did not accompany the militia, for it is not mentioned except in Joshua 3ff. The ark appears in 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 11:11. Numbers 10:35, however, connects the

unimportance of the human warriors is also evidenced by the fact that the number of men does not play any role.[1] The wars of Israel are the wars of Yahwe, and the enemies of Israel are the enemies of Yahwe.[2] The wars of Yahwe are miracles; the holy terror of Yahwe comes over the nations and they lose their spirit of resistance.[3]

The camp of the holy militia was the oldest sanctuary of Israel because that was where Yahwe was to be found; war was his most original element.[4] The warlike character of Yahwe is confirmed by the name Yahwe Sabaoth. (יהוה צבאת). This name of Yahwe is missing throughout the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges. In the books of Samuel the name Yahwe Sabaoth is closely connected with the ark. Von Rad supposes therefore that the name came into existence during the eleventh century in Shiloh. Since we found the verb צבא as a term denoting Levitical service, we have to conclude that, in opposition to von Rad, the name יהוה צבאת, as connected with the ark, was a Levitical name for Yahwe and may very well be older than the eleventh century. Our tradition offers two forms of the name, יהוה צבאת and

---

war actions of Yahwe with the ark. The fact that the ark is not mentioned in Judges does not have to mean it was not there. When Yahwe was present the ark was too, and Yahwe was the leader, as all texts concur.

[1] Judges 7:2ff.; 1 Samuel 14:6; 17:45ff.

[2] 1 Samuel 18:17; 25:28; Judges 5:31; 1 Samuel 30:26.

[3] Exodus 23:27; Joshua 10:10; Judges 4:15; Exodus 15:14-16 etc. Cf. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg..., pp. 10ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

יהוה אלהי צבאת . 1 Samuel 17:45, in using the former one, refers to the armies of Israel. In the prophetic writings, the name Yahwe Sabaoth is found 247 times.[1] To some scholars the reference to Yahwe as the god of Israel's armies seems strange, especially when it appears in words of doom. Therefore one[2] tried to connect צבאת with the heavenly host,[3] but this connection is probably post-exilic. That the prophetic reference to Yahwe צבאת is not so absurd as it may seem we shall see later.

The invasion of the nomadic elements into Palestine was probably not a warlike action. We cannot speak about the invasion movement as a holy war because the "tribes" infiltrated into the country and their military strength was not so great that they could have dared to fight the Canaanites, especially since the latter occupied fortified cities. The holy war presupposes the existence of the tribal amphictyony, and even may have been the birthplace of the amphictyony. Through the common threat from outside, the separate elements were forced to rely upon one another. They formed covenants

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 28. The name Yahwe Sabaoth is missing in Hosea (12:6 ?), but the prophets of Judah and Jerusalem use the name (cf. Micah 4:4; Zephaniah 2:9; Amos 5:16f.). For Isaiah it is the divine name par excellence (cf. F. Dumermuth, "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen," ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 71). In Jeremiah it appears 62 times; those prophets who emphasize the kingship and leadership of Yahwe and show connections with the holy war (Isaiah) or with the Levites (Jeremiah from the priests of Anathoth) use the name Yahwe Sabaoth most frequently.

[2] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 28.

[3] Genesis 2:1.

with one another and the military result of these covenants was the holy war.

In the institution of the holy war the tribe experienced the protection of their god Yahwe and the far-reaching consequences of the bond with Yahwe.[1] The people left it completely up to Yahwe when they were threatened from outside. Yahwe inspired a charismatic person to be the leader of the holy war. After the campaign was over this man disappeared and we seldom hear from him again. A good example in point is the book of Judges, which is filled with holy wars. All holy wars seem to have been defensive wars. The annexation of Canaanite cities by individual tribes is never called a holy war. That the holy war is closely connected with the covenant is shown in Judges 21:6ff. One member of the amphictyony, the tribe of Benjamin, had violated the covenantal shalom, thus a holy war was called against it. Benjamin barely escaped extinction.

Israel's part in the holy war was to help Yahwe[2] and to have faith.[3] We never hear about Baal leading a holy war. Baalim do not lead holy wars. Their's is another realm, which is the life of nature and man. Thus the holy war is a particular characteristic of Yahwe. The god of the desert, the one

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 19.

[2] Judges 5:23; Joshua 11:6.

[3] Exodus 14:13.

who led the Israelites out of Egypt, was also a god of war. If we then consider the military terminology connected with the service of the Levites, we have another evidence of a close and perhaps original relationship of the Levites to Yahwe.

The Ark

Before we continue our discussion of the Levitical priesthood we have to try to gather some information on the ark, for it was closely connected with the Levites and may have been the main object of their service.

We have no exact description of the ark in early documents. The only account is found in the P document, Exodus 25:10ff. Von Rad, however, thinks that P renders the description of older sources.[1] J and E in their report on the time in the desert mention the ark only in Numbers 10:35f. and 14:36-45. Von Rad proposes that the ark belongs in the archaeological category of the empty thrones of gods.[2] He admits, however, that this cannot be the oldest concept of the ark, since the ark is nowhere called a throne, but is designated a "coffin".

The next description of the ark is offered by Deuteronomy. The ark is here a container for the tables of the covenant.[3] According to the deuteronomistic concept, the ark is rationalized and demythologized because for Deuteronomy Yahwe dwells in heaven and at the cult place he only deposited his name.[4] In contrast to von Rad, we have to reckon with the

---

[1] Von Rad, *Theologie...*, p. 236.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Deuteronomy 10:1-5; 1 Kings 8:9.

[4] Deuteronomy 26:15; 12:5,11,21; cf.von Rad, *Theologie...*, p. 237.

possibility that the deuteronomistic concept of the ark may preserve some old knowledge. We will discover that Deuteronomy revives a number of old traditions, especially those which are connected with the holy war and the Levitical priesthood.

Furthermore, that the ark is not conceived as a throne in Deuteronomy is not too surprising considering the Deuteronomist's ideas on the monarchy. Deuteronomy goes back to the charismatic concept of monarchy,[1] and thus re-establishes the exclusive kingship of Yahwe. To avoid the connotations with the king's throne in Jerusalem, Deuteronomy may have gone back to some older traditions about the ark.[2] It resorted to the northern shem theology. A sanctuary is not elevated above all other sanctuaries because it shelters the ark but because Yahwe lets his name (shem) dwell there. The ark thus was stripped of its basic significance: a symbol of the presence of Yahwe. Yahwe's name (shem) was now the symbol of his presence.

---

[1] For this see the section on Deuteronomy.

[2] The relationship between the ark and Deuteronomy is made more difficult through the critical examination of the text of Deuteronomy. According to F. Dumermuth, "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen," ZAW, LXX (1958), pp. 70ff., the north, which is the probable home of Deuteronomy, considered itself the true preserver of Yahwist traditions. The problem was that the ark stood in the temple at Jerusalem. Accordingly the ark is nowhere mentioned in the basic content of Deuteronomy. Likewise the name "Yahwe Sabaoth" which was connected with the ark is missing. For the authors of Deuteronomy the problem was: how could Yahwe be present without being connected with the ark? Dumermuth suggests that the shem theology substituted the

[illegible] that the [illegible] of the [illegible] greatest [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] with [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible], [illegible] in [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible] with the [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible]. [illegible] of other [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] of the [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible]

The account of Deuteronomy concerning the ark does not help us to find out what the ark originally was like. We have to turn to some other sources for suggestions. Both E. Nielsen[1] and Danell[2] come to the result that the ark was originally the coffin in which the bones of Joseph were embalmed, brought from Egypt, and buried at Shechem on the ground which Jacob had acquired from the Shechemites.[3]

---

missing ark. When the northern Deuteronomy came to Jerusalem we find the *shem* theology in disagreement with the ark theology. This is the reason that the ark loses its cultic functions. The ark becomes the container of the laws and thus really declines in value. Dumermuth, however, is wrong when he thinks that this fits very well the historical situatinn because the ark was lost in the catastrophe of 587. According to Dumermuth, Deuteronomy was written under the influence of these historical events. However this date is too late for the origin of even the late parts of Deuteronomy. We accept the influence of the northern *shem* theology upon the south. But we would rather connect the devaluation of the cultic significance of the ark with the develuation of the Jerusalem temple which we find in the "basic Deuteronomy". Thus it is not necessary to reconstruct a "basic Deuteronomy". Deuteronomy mentions the ark. (Cf. Deuteronomy 10:31 and Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1953), p. 40.) *Shem* theology and the ark as container of the tablets of the *law* do not disagree with each other.

[1] E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[2] Danell, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-48.

[3] Genesis 50:25f.; Exodus 13:19; Joshua 24:32. The last two references do not mention the "coffin", ארון, but are considered by Danell to be parts of the same tradition. He suggests that the term ארון could have been avoided to prevent confusion with the ark of Moses. Here Danell apparently makes a distinction between the ark and the coffin with the bones of Joseph; he does not remain consistent. Because the bones of Joseph were preserved at Shechem, whose god was called Baal berith, the ark is called the ark of the covenant in Numbers 14:14; Joshua 3:3,6,8,11,14,17. Danell considers Shechem and Shiloh as sanctuaries of the ark of the covenant. Shechem may be an insertion; the connection of the ark with Shechem is contested (see E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-315.).

Finally we have to consider the interesting thesis of Morgenstern about the character of the Ark.[1] Until the erection of the temple in Jerusalem under Solomon, the ark had stood in the national tent sanctuary. Morgenstern points out the drawing of the departure of the ark from the temple of Dagon[2] as it is depicted on the wall of the synagogue at Dura. The strange thing is that the ark, mounted on a cart drawn by oxen, is depicted not as a box but as a small tent with curtains which concealed the contents of the tent. Morgenstern believes that the Jews at Dura had some good reason for ignoring the tradition of their time about the ark, which was the orthodox concept of the Priestly code where the ark was a box-like structure. The Jews at Dura, according to Morgenstern, preserved an old knowledge of the form of the ark.[3] Through the comparison of the term ארגז, which appears in 1 Samuel 6:8,11,15 with the pre-Islamic Arabic equivalent, Morgenstern concludes that the ark was not at all a box-like structure; rather it was something like a *howdag*, a female camel saddle with the Arabic *kubbe* mounted upon it.[4] Through emendation Morgenstern gains the following translation of Amos 5:26: "And you will take up

---

[1] Morgenstern, *op. cit.*, pp. 94ff.

[2] 1 Samuel 5.

[3] Morgenstern, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

the tent of your king and the base of your two images - and I will drive you into exile beyond Damascus."[1] The "tent of your king" is equated by Morgenstern with the kubbe of the pre-Islamic tribal chief. It is a symbol of royalty, the "regular and proper symbol of supreme authority."[2]

What about the term ארון? Morgenstern conjectures that ארון is a proper name for a type of tribal tent sanctuary. He compares the otfe of the Ruwala bedouins with the ark. This otfe has the name "Al-Markab", which is translated "the riding vehicle".[3] The reason why the otfe or the ark of Israel was called ארון may lie in the peculiar shape of the Israelite tent sanctuary.

---

[1] Morgenstern, op. cit., p. 110.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 112.

The Tent of Meeting[1]

In the Priestly document, the אהל מועד is the place where Yahwe meets his people, or rather, where he meets the priest as mediator between himself and the people. Exodus 25:22; 30:6,36; Numbers 17:19 and Exodus 29:42-43 describe the where and how of the encounter. Morgenstern finds in these texts two strata of P, Exodus 25:22; 30:6,36 and Numbers 17:19. They mention a veil which separates the holy of holies from the main section of the tabernacle. Exodus 29:42-43 belongs to an earlier stratum which does not know the veil and which makes the meeting place of Yahwe and people the door of the tabernacle. The latter account does not know about the later temple, where the holy of holies was the innermost section of the sanctuary. Von Rad supports the view that P is renewing the old tent-and-appearance-theology which stands in opposition to the real indwelling of Yahwe in the Salomonic temple.[2]

---

[1] The word ארון is a Canaanite word familiar in Phoenician ארן, Aramean ארנה, and Assyrian *aranu*. (Cf. Widengren, *op. cit.*, p. 8, and Wilhelm Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch uber das Alte Testament* (Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1949), p. 64.) The term ארון for the ark then may have been the term of the settled, Canaanized Israel for the nomad's "tent of meeting". As the tent lost its significance as a dwelling place for Israel, the original importance of the "tent of meeting" was lost or forgotten and only preserved in some lines of tradition. A new name which fit the new cultic and life situation was given to the "tent of meeting". The descriptive term ארון was chosen.

[2] Von Rad, *Theologie...*, p. 86. Cf. 1 Kings 8:12f; 2 Kings 19:14.

We have some traditions about the אהל מועד that are older than P. In Exodus 33:7-11 we possess an isolated text which talks about the sacred tent used by Moses to contact Yahwe, and which is called אהל מועד.[1] Von Rad thinks that this tradition goes back even into the time before the "tribes" settled in Canaan. He also says that this tent is not identical with the P tent of meeting and that it did not contain the ark.[2] We do not hear about any construction of this tent;[3] it appears as an established cult object and is a means of communication and consultation with Yahwe. The tent here is definitely connected with the camps of the Israelites in the desert. The tent is pitched outside the camp. It is not at all considered a dwelling place of Yahwe; rather, it is the place where Yahwe and Moses meet whenever necessary for the good of the people.

When we compare the tradition about the ark with that about the tent of meeting, we find for the olden times three mentions of the tent[4] as against two of the ark.[5] Then the tradition about the tent almost vanishes, while the

---

[1] Von Rad attributes Exodus 33:7-11 to E (cf. Theologie..., p. 234), while Morgenstern regards it as J (op. cit., p. 142).

[2] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 234.

[3] Exodus 26:1ff. is late and therefore of no historical value.

[4] Exodus 33:7-11; Numbers 11:16,24-26; 12:4.

[5] Numbers 10:35f.; 14:39-45.

tradition of the ark becomes stronger and we are able to follow it through the centuries.

In summary, we have to agree with Morgenstern that there is some evidence for the identity of ark and tent of meeting. Although they are helpful, we cannot emphasize the Arabic parallels which establish the identity of kubbe-otfe, ארון, as much as Morgenstern does. Weightier seems to be the fact that when the tradition about the tent ceases, the traditions of the ark increase. The tradition connects the Levites with the ark. Moses, who is considered a Levite, is connected with the tent in the very ancient text of Exodus 33:7-11. He apparently does what the Levites do later: he inquires of the Lord. Urim and thummim may play a role in this inquiry.[1] The tent is connected with the camp, as was the ark.

Among the Arabs the kubbe was mounted on a camel's back. The Israelites were small-animal nomads and had no camels; therefore the Levites carried the ark. This may have determined the shape of the Israelite kubbe, the tent of meeting, so that it was called ארון. Both ark and tent emphasize the "nomadic character" of Yahwe. One difficulty in establishing the identity of the ark and tent is that the tent disappeared when the tribes became settled. The ark, however, continued in its important role as the cultic center

---

[1] Exodus 28:30; Numbers 27:21; Leviticus 8:8.

of the tribes for a while, but this could be explained. We know that after settlement the Israelites annexed ancient Canaanite shrines and that the ark rested in those sanctuaries. The term אהל מועד would therefore lose its meaning because the sanctuaries had their own names. The tent significance of the אהל מועד was incongruous when it was within a house or temple.

The term "tent of meeting" was preserved as a remnant of desert days. The tent was no longer the only place where Yahwe could be consulted. After the settlement there were many places and the tent of meeting lost its uniqueness. Only in the holy wars during the pre-monarchical period and under Saul and David did it still have its old importance. At those times it was removed from the sanctuary where it was "residing" in order to go with the armies of Israel.

The deuteronomist changes the significance of the ark into a container of the torah tablets. Von Rad, as mentioned above, considers this move by the deuteronomist a rationalization and demythologization.[1] Von Rad continues and says that from then on the tent of meeting could also be called אהל העדות (tent of testimony).[2] This term corresponds exactly with the deuteronomistic term for

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 237.

[2] Ibid.

the ark, ~~אהל~~ ארון העדות.[1] In a rationalized and demythologized stage as in Deuteronomy, the tent and the Ark were equated. This equation could hardly be a later invention, but is probably based upon some old knowledge about the situation in the beginning.

---

[1] For ארון העדות see Exodus 25:22; 26:33,34; 30:6,26; 31:7; Numbers 7:5; 7:89, etc. For אהל העדות see Numbers 9:15; 17:7,8; 18:3.

The Ark as Cultic Center of the Tribes

The earliest tradition concerning the ark in the historical books is 1 Samuel 1-4.[1] The ark was located in the shrine at Shiloh in the territory of the tribe of Ephraim. One may conclude that possibly the ark was in the beginning the cult object of the tribe of Ephraim only.[2] The ark was not permanently stationed there.[3] In Joshua 20:28 we hear about the ark in connection with another Ephraimite sanctuary, Bethel. Another shrine of the ark had been Gilgal.[4]

There is the question about the relationship of Shechem and the ark. Nielsen asserts that in the original traditions of Shechem the ark does not appear.[5] Shechem was the place of the covenant traditions, and in the original traditions about the ark the covenant is not mentioned. Nielsen considers 1 Samuel 1ff., Deuteronomy 31:9ff., and 1 Kings 8 as harmonizations of the two conceptions of covenant and ark.[6] Nielsen also disregards the suggestion of

---

[1] E. Nielsen, _op_. _cit_., p. 320.

[2] Morgenstern, _op_. _cit_., p. 80.

[3] Judges 20:26; 21:2; 19.

[4] Joshua 3:4.

[5] E. Nielsen, _op_. _cit_., p. 336.

[6] _Ibid_.

Noth that the ark "once played a special part in the Shechemite rituals and that from Shechem it was moved southwards, perhaps to Bethel".[1] But in Joshua 24:1,25 the Septuagint reads "Shiloh" instead of "Shechem". In the Gideon-Abimilech cycle the ark is not mentioned at all. The traditions of the ark in Joshua are deuteronomized and talk about the ark as the "ark of the covenant", or the "ark of testimony". In the very important tradition of Joshua 24 containing the covenant between Israel and Yahwe which takes place at Shechem, again we do not hear anything about the ark.

The reason for the secondary combination of the ark tradition and the covenant (Shechem) tradition may be that Deuteronomy was strongly influenced by a covenant theology _and_ by groups which considered the ark the most sacred object of Israel.[2] It is conceivable that the Levites are responsible for the combination as the possible authors of Deuteronomy and champions of the ark. They were also strongly interested in the covenantal theology which was the basis for the old tribal amphictyony with its holy wars.

We can say that the ark may have had merely tribal significance in the beginning. However, through the covenant at Shechem which brought the middle Palestinian tribes together, mainly Ephraim and Manasseh, the "house Joseph" and some

---

[1] E. Nielsen, _op. cit._, p. 315.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 316.

northern tribes, the ark, which may have been the cult object of "Joseph" alone, became the center of a small amphictyony. Just before the time of Saul the ark was lost to the Philistines.[1] With them it stayed for a short time. Then Beth Shemesh[2] and Kirjath-jearim sheltered the ark. From Kirjath-jearim David brought the ark into his new capital, and there it stayed until it perished in the destruction of 587 B.C. The ark must have had well established cultic and amphictyonic significance.

The action of David was a political masterpiece because through the ark his new capital which had no Israelite tradition at once became the worship center of the tribes and thus a national sanctuary which stood in David's own territory. On the other hand, the ark lost its significance of meaning Yahwe's presence among Israel's armies. David fought some holy wars, but his successor Solomon built the temple and the ark was tied to the Jerusalemite temple hill. This hill during the progress of time becomes the "Mount Zion",[3] "the mount of the house of God",[4] "the mountain of Yahwe".[5] Zion becomes the holy mountain. The ark lost its cultic significance and surrendered it to the place where Solomon built his temple, which probably was an old Jebusite cult site.

---

[1] 2 Samuel 4.

[2] Here in Beth Shemesh the Levites suddenly appear when the ark returned from Philistea (1 Samuel 6:15).

[3] Isaiah 8:18.

[4] Micah 3:12.

[5] Isaiah 2:3; Micah 4:2.

The Cultic Functions of the Levites

Deuteronomy 18:1-8 gives us a description of the duties of the Levites. The provisions are: Levites shall have no property or heritage like the rest of Israel (v.1) because the Lord is their heritage (v.2); they shall live from the sacrificial animals (v.3); besides the sacrificial animals the Levites may receive grain, wine, oil and sheep wool (v.4). The reasons for all this is that the Lord has chosen the Levites out of all tribes to be priests and pronounce the blessing. When a Levite leaves his place and comes to any other place of worship which the Lord has chosen, the Levite shall have the same rights as his brothers, the Levites who are priests of the Lord at that chosen sanctuary (v.9ff.).[1]

The provisions for the Levites in Deuteronomy may very well be older than Deuteronomy. In 10:8ff. a tradition is inserted which follows the Sinai traditions of Exodus 32ff.[2] The Lord selected the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the

---

[1] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 268, assumes that the reference to "the sanctuary which the Lord chooses" (v.6) means the central shrine at Jerusalem. The priests there are called brothers of the Levites. This passage shows a reconciliation between the priests of the central shrine and the priests from the country. But the assumption that Jerusalem is the shrine "which the Lord chooses" is not justified by the text. We would suggest that any sanctuary could be meant here and the text may refer to the right of the Levites to minister to the Lord at any sanctuary.

[2] Ibid.

covenant, to minister for him and pronounce his blessing. Deuteronomy offers two further traditions on the Levites, Deuteronomy 27:14 and 33:8-11. Deuteronomy 27:14 uses the word "singer" for the Levites reciting the curses of the Shechemite ritual.[1] Apparently the "liturgical" form of reciting the curses was called singing. This is supported by the form of the verses following 27:14ff., which show a strong poetical rhythm.[2] The passage of Deuteronomy 33:8-11

---

[1] E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

[2] Cf. Alfred Bertholet, *Deuteronomium* (Freiburg i.B.: J.C.B. Mohr, (Paul Siebeck), 1899), p. 84. Here Bertholet has emphasized that the curses refer to the deuteronomistic law and do not care for minute things upon which the deuteronomist lays great stress. Therefore Bertholet excludes the authorship of Deuteronomy for this part and settles on the exilic authorship. But the *Sitz im Leben* of this line of curses is probably the Shechem ritual, as Nielsen suggests. The significance of a Shechem ritual after or in the exile is difficult to comprehend. Rather, according to the traditional character of Deuteronomy, we must assume that Deuteronomy included here old material, which was used in that respective Shechemite ritual through the centuries during the existence of the northern kingdom. To quote Alt in *Kleine Schriften*, I, pp. 324-25 (my translation), on Deuteronomy 27: "This succession [of curses] shall be presented orally to the assembly of Israel in the great amphitheater between Ebal and Gerizim in the pass of Shechem by the Levitical priests, and each curse shall be received by the assembled people with a loud Amen. The apodictic succession of sentences forms here the core of a sacred act of national dimension. The speakers are the speakers of Yahwe, the Levitical priests. Their function in the national assembly was not at all only the furthering of the cultic relationship with Yahwe, but at least to the same degree the proclamation of his will to Israel [Deuteronomy 33:10]. The recently gained insight that the shrine at Shechem was commonly used and visited by the amphictyony of Israelite tribes in earliest time, that it possibly was at first its only cult place in Palestine, brings the scene of Deuteronomy 27 even more into the realm of historical probability."

describes more closely the cultic responsibilities of the Levites. It speaks about urim and thummim, the teaching of torah, and sacrificial duties.

Urim and thummim were sacred lots.[1] They were a means of inquiry, offering to the Levites an established method of finding out the will of Yahwe for certain occasions. A good example is the procedure depicted in 1 Samuel 14. Saul suggests a sneak attack upon the Philistines by night, whereupon the priests ask for inquiry of the Lord. By means of the priests Saul asks Yahwe the question: "Shall I go down after the Philistines? Wilt thou deliver them into the hands of Israel?"[2] No answer came from God. The reason was sin among Israel. Through the casting of the sacred lots, urim and thummim, the sinner Jonathan is discovered.[3]

Another realm of priestly "vocational" knowledge was sacred medicine.[4] Leviticus 13 may be called the leper torah,

---

[1] Gray, op. cit., p. 221.

[2] 1 Samuel 14:37.

[3] Do we have to assume the use of urim and thummim in the initial inquiry? Cf. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, Die Samuelbücher (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956), p. 89, Anm. 2. This author supposes the initial inquiry used urim and thummim, although they are not mentioned there. That it was without any result was due to the fact that neither the yes-lot nor the no-lot appeared. For further evidence of the use of urim and thummim as sacred lots or means of inquiring of Yahwe, see: Deuteronomy 33:8; 1 Samuel 28:6; Exodus 28:30; Leviticus 8:8; Numbers 27:21; Joshua 9:14; Judges 1:1; 20:18; 23:27; 2 Samuel 2:1; 5:19,23. From the time of Solomon on, the use of urim and thummim as a means of inquiry lost its significance.

[4] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 245.

and in chapter 15 we find laws concerning other diseases. Most of these diseases refer to the realm of clean and unclean. Cultic cleansing and the enforcement of the respective laws must have been one of the main tasks of the priests. The words of the priests were the words of Yahwe himself and gave the necessary authority to the priestly decisions.

To eat sacrificed meat was another duty of the priests.[1] This meat belonged to Yahwe and no layman was allowed to touch it. It was the meat of the sacrificial animal upon which sins were transferred.[2] The priests seemed to occupy some mediatorial function because the Levites were "to bear the iniquity of the community, that atonement might be made for them before the Lord."[3]

It was the task of the Levites "to bless the cult community with Yahwe's name."[4] Mowinckel considers the blessing function of the Levites to be the essence of their whole cultic service.[5] To receive the blessing of Yahwe in all its forms, and thus to make the favor of Yahwe outgoing to all Israel, the people came to the sanctuaries and participated in the cult. Blessing included the "material"

---

[1] Leviticus 10:17ff.

[2] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 247.

[3] Leviticus 10:17.

[4] Numbers 6:22,27.

[5] Sigmund Mowinckel, Religion und Kultus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1953), p. 64.

as well as the "spiritual" realms. Life, the fertility of man and animal, health, soil, and the basic requirements of life, all these had their source in the blessing.[1]

The most important task of the Levitical priests was the preaching of torah. The technical term for the cultic service of the Levites is עבד. There are 76 instances for the usage of the root עבד in the Old Testament. Two-thirds of these instances refer to the cult service of the Levites. Besides the verb, the noun עבדה is used 56 times for denoting the same activity.[2] Most of the instances are found in the book of Numbers, and refer to the service of the Levites at the tabernacle during the time

---

[1] Cf. Mowinckel, Religion und Kultus, pp. 64-65. Here he directs our attention toward the old view that in the mutual dependency of god and people not only the people receive and increase their blessing but also, at the same time, increased blessing is created for Yahwe. The congregation blesses Yahwe (cf. Psalm 29:1). In later Israel this expression was transformed into the meaning "to thank God". Originally this idea and practice may have come from a type of cult where the strength of a god was dependent upon the strength of his people. We find this idea in the modern world of today just as we have to assume that it was the general idea of "what cult was" in ancient times. When a god and a nation were allied to one another through covenantal or other bonds, the luck of the nation depended upon the strength of its god. When a nation was defeated its god was defeated; when a nation was victorious its god was victorious. He proved himself to be stronger than the god or gods of the defeated nation. Israel's faith was of the same type, to a certain degree. We have to assume that the skepticism in Israel was a result of the failure of Yahwe to prove himself to be the strongest god. This skepticism is recorded in the prophets and we shall see that through the prophets this skepticism was overcome.

[2] Lindhagen, op. cit., p. 110.

in the wilderness.[1] Besides the service at the tent or tabernacle,[2] עבד denotes the service of bearing[3] the "dwelling of the testimony" as we have already indicated above. We have another term for the priestly service ירה. The noun derived from ירה is תורה.[4] Cult and torah were two things which kept the amphictyony of tribes together in the time preceding the monarchy. The service of the priests as the counselors and torah teachers of Israel and communicators of the divine decisions is clearly attested in Deuteronomy 33:8-11.

The question is whether this torah teaching function which Deuteronomy emphasizes so much had been the task of the Levites before the exile. When David moved the ark to Jerusalem and Solomon built the temple and gave a permanent location to the ark, the Levites lost their main functions, which were connected with the ark. As we shall prove later, the Levites had nothing to do with the cultic operations in Jerusalem. The priests of Jerusalem were Zadokites, members of the old Jebusite priesthood. The ark went to Jerusalem and stayed there. From then on the Levites had nothing to do with the ark any more.

---

[1] Lindhagen, op. cit., p. 110.

[2] Numbers 3:7; 4:23-43; 8:15-26; 16:9; 18:4-31.

[3] Numbers 1:50ff.; 4:15.

[4] Hosea 4:6; Isaiah 28:9; Jeremiah 2:8.

[5] Hentschke, op. cit., p. 130.

Something similar happened to the Levites in the northern kingdom. King Jeroboam's imitation of the temple in Jerusalem went so far that he installed a non-Levitical priesthood at Bethel. This may be considered an attempt to bind the national northern sanctuary closely to the king, perhaps in the same way as the temple in Jerusalem was the private chapel of the Davidic kings. The presence of Levites at the national northern shrine may have been considered uncomfortable by Jeroboam I. The Levites got their character of being true Yahwists by fighting the apostasy of the golden bull.[1] Jeroboam I installed bull worship at Bethel, the national northern sanctuary.[2] Nielsen is right in asserting that the sanctuary at Bethel was not founded by Jeroboam I.[3] The king took as priests in Bethel the priests from the bamoth who were not Levites.[4] Thus in the north also the Levites became an opposition. Their influence there may always have been stronger, since the royal cult at Bethel never gained the status which the royal

---

[1] Exodus 32.

[2] 1 Kings 12. Dan was also a site for bull worship.

[3] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 197.

[4] 1 Kings 12:32. Nielsen has also pointed out inconsistency of the record in 1 Kings 12:32. Elsewhere in Deuteronomy the Levites just denote the priests of the local sanctuaries (op. cit., p. 198), while in 1 Kings 12:32 they are called non-Levites. Combining the priests at Bethel with the bamoth, the deuteronomist added to the sins of Jeroboam I the sin of tolerating local shrines.

cult in Jerusalem did.

The holy wars were abandoned and the Levites lost their functions as the bodyguard of the ark and the spiritual leaders of the militia. The kings fought their wars with mercenaries. But the Levites did not surrender the traditions which had been connected with the ark through a century-long history of holy war, covenant, and the covenantal law. It is conceivable therefore that after their major source of influence and their main cultic function was taken from them, that the Levites concentrated on those traditions. The teaching of the torah was one of the duties of the Levites before the exile.[1]

Originally the torah had been something very personal; it was the covenantal will of Yahwe, which could not be made objective.[2] Therefore "speaking justice" was something that possessed a certain charismatic authority. Deuteronomy sees in the will of Yahwe "merely" an object of preaching, but it still is the manifestation of Yahwe's personal covenantal will. Deuteronomy understood this "right" as something which distinguished Israel from other nations and evidenced its particular closeness to Yahwe.[3] Deuteronomy revived old traditions. The preservers of those

---

[1] Gray, op. cit., pp. 220-222.

[2] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 102.

[3] Ibid. Cf. Deuteronomy 4:6-8.

traditions were the Levites. One may speak about a Levitical reformation which preceeded the reformatory events under Josiah.[1] As we have said, the Levites must have developed some preaching activity during the time of the kings before the exile.[2] The variety of traditions which are revived does not permit us to assume lay authorship. Among the traditions revived was also the "law of the covenant", but the Levites also preached about sentences of the casuistic law.

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 79.

[2] Ibid.

CHAPTER II

THE MONARCHY

CHAPTER II

THE MONARCHY

The Beginning of the Monarchy in Israel: The Charismatic King

When discussing the monarchy in Israel, one is struck by a most remarkable fact: how late Israel was in establishing the institution of the kingship. The Israelites lived in a country which had known city kings since the bronze age. Other nations which were related to Israel very soon after their settlement accepted the institution of the monarchy. Israel lived in Canaan at least two hundred years without having a king. The only explanation for this phenomenon is that the idea of the kingship must not have been alive in old Israel, and certainly we have to conclude that the Israelites did not bring this idea with them from the time before the settlement in Canaan. Israel must have had a great hesitation and reticence where the monarchy was concerned. The cause of this hesitation may have been the form in which the kingship presented itself in Canaan.

In Canaan the political institution of the kingship was intimately connected with the cultic functions of a divine king.[1] Even if Bentzen is right in his assumption that the idea of the divine king stems from the concept of the *Urmensch* which incorporates the tribal or national whole, this would have no value for Israel;[2] Israel does not know a figure like the *Urmensch*, not even in its premonarchical period. We do not even find chieftains among the old Israelites. The tribes were represented through a *presbyterium*, the elders who spoke the law and judged the people. We know only one office in the premonarchical period who is an all-Israelite one: the so-called minor judges.[3] We do not even know with certainty about a continuous or heritable priesthood, in spite of an amphictyonic cult center.[4]

After living for centuries without a king, Israel finally established the institution of the kingship. This kingship is fundamentally different from the kingship which we know from the Canaanite cities, however. The early Israelite king is not more than one of the judges where his

---

[1] Martin Noth, "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1950, p. 175, hereafter referred to as *ZTK*.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* Cf. Judges 10:1-5; 12:7-15.

[4] *Ibid.*

standing is concerned. These judges which we refer to have nothing in common with the so-called minor judges. These judges were charismatic leaders of the militia, sometimes of one tribe only, sometimes of a number of tribes. Thus their authority was regionally limited. Eglon was a Benjaminite, Gideon a Manassite, Barak was from Naphtali, Jephthah from Gilead, and Samson was a member of the tribe of Dan.[1] The judges were men called by God to lead parts of Israel against their enemies. They never engaged in a war of national dimension. After having completed their task, the judges usually stepped back into the unknown, out of which Yahwe had called them.

One of the judges, however, did not step back into the unknown out of which Yahwe had called him. The story of Gideon does not end with Gideon but is continued with his son Abimelech. Here it is that we have the first adventure into the monarchy among the tribes of Israel. After his success, Gideon was offered the kingship. He turned it

---

[1] The last two, Jephthah and Samson, do not quite fit the category of the rest of the judges. Jephthah was an outlaw, a David-like figure, gathering other outlaws around himself (cf. Judges 10:3ff.). The elders of Gilead hired him to be their leader against the Ammonites. We do not hear about a divine call; charisma is not what makes Jephthah the leader, it is his military ability. Samson has hardly anything to do with a tribe or the military action of a tribe. The tradition depicts him as a berserk man whose occupation it is to fight for himself against enemies which usually outnumber him. Hempel is probably right in suggesting that the tradition about Samson is the historization of the myth of the sun god Shemesh (cf. his article in ZAW, LXV (1953), p. 113.).

down with the argument that Yahwe ruled over Israel.[1] The text obviously understands this kingship as the kingship over all of Israel. Gideon, however, can only have been the leader of his tribe or of a few northern tribes.[2] The kingship offered him can therefore have been only a limited one, just as the kingship which his son Abimelech usurped was a limited one. Pedersen makes a point of the status of Abimelech, who was not a full son, but was like Jephthah an illegitimate son.[3] In contrast to the rest of his brothers, Abimelech was close to the relatives of his mother, who was a Shechemite.[4] Like Jephthah, Abimelech gathered around himself outlaws, employing them as a kind of bodyguard.[5] After the bodyguard assassinated his brothers, Abimelech let himself be made king by the inhabitants of the city of Shechem. His kingship did not last very long.

Connected with the tradition about the episode of the kingship of Abimelech, we find in Judges 9 the strongest

---

[1] Judges 8:23.

[2] Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 38.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[4] The theophorous name Abimelech had been adopted from the Canaanites. This name combined two different divine titles: father and king. In Old Testament tradition this was the first name formed with the theophorous element *melek* and it may not be accidental that Abimelech also is the first Israelite who was called king. Cf. Buber, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 27-28.

[5] Judges 9:4.

anti-monarchical piece of literature in the Old Testament.[1] The fable of Jotham makes a caricature of the kingship of Abimelech and of kingship in general in a programmatic way. Only the thornbush, the least among all trees, was willing to accept the position of king. "In the present context the contrast between fruit trees and thorn means that kingship is a useless and unproductive activity."[2] The author of the book of Judges propagates a society without a head, at least without a visible head, when we see the fable of Jotham in connection with the answer of Gideon: "...the Lord rules over you."[3]

The tradition concerning the kingship of Saul begins like the story about one of the judges.[4] Messengers come from

---

[1] Pedersen, *op. cit.*, III-IV, p. 40; Buber, *Königtum Gottes*, pp. 29ff.;E.Nielsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 149ff.

[2] E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

[3] Judges $\overset{9}{8}$:23. Verses 16-19 offer a very valuable piece of historical information. These verses are sometimes considered secondary in relation to the fable itself, but nevertheless enlighten the historical background, of the time of Abimelech, considerably (cf. E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 151). The first notice says that Gideon's defeat of the Midianites was not only a service to the Manassites but also to the citizens of Shechem. This supports the thesis of the gradual and peaceful invasion of some of the nomadic tribal groups into Palestine. They concluded covenants with some Canaanite cities, which gave them part of their pasture land; the nomads in return secured the Canaanites from raids of other nomads (in this case the Midianites). The second notice says that Abimelech, although he was the king of Shechem, did not dwell inside the city, but lived from the ambushing of caravans which passed by (v.25).

[4] 1 Samuel 11:4ff.

Jabesh-Gilead and report the trouble in which they find themselves. Saul listens to the messengers and the spirit of Yahwe seizes him; he cuts an oxen and sends the parts of it to the tribes of Israel. This is the call for a holy war. Saul liberates the people of Jabesh. So far, these are the historical facts as we see them. The problem which we face is: what was the role of Samuel in the establishment of Saul's kingship? 1 Samuel 11:14 speaks about the renewal of the kingship, while the next verse, verse 15, speaks about the establishment of the kingship. Samuel apparently had nothing to do with the liberation of Jabesh. Certainly Saul had not been proclaimed king before the expedition against the Ammonites.

The tradition presents the anointing of Saul and the proclamation of his kingship before the Jabesh campaign.[1] Saul was actually the last of the judges. The call of Yahwe had authorized his leadership as it had authorized the leadership of the judges. Saul was also the first of the kings of Israel, because his leadership did not end after the liberation of Jabesh. What caused Israel to make the leader of the Benjaminites, and perhaps of the Ephraimites also,

---

[1] 1 Samuel 10:1,24. Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 68, considers the different versions about the beginning of the kingship of Saul as different traditions of different sanctuaries: Mizpah has its version in 10:17-27; Bethel (?) 9:1-10,16; Gilgal in chapter 11.

the king over all of Israel?[1]

---

[1] The traditions about the rise of Saul in 1 Samuel 9:10 do not help us very much in finding out the reasons for Saul's kingship. As a whole they hardly reflect the historical development. The first episode in Ch. 9 does not speak about Samuel, but mentions simply a "man of God". However, in the second episode Samuel suddenly appears without being called "man of God" or "prophet". Saul calls him a seer, but later Samuel is mentioned without any title. Another indication for the presence of different strata in our tradition is the depiction of Saul himself and the way he was made king. In the first half of Ch. 9 Saul seems to be inferior; he depends on his servant in the search for the asses, and does not even have money. On the other hand Saul is depicted as a tall, handsome man. In the moment Saul became king he is not a young man any longer, for he had a son who served in the militia (1 Samuel 13:1ff). Saul's father Kish was a wealthy man(9:1). This does not correspond very well with 9:21, where Saul claims to come from the least family in Benjamin. The author of 1 Samuel apparently is demonstrating the power of Yahwe, who chose his man from among the smallest family in the least tribe in Israel (cf. Hans Wildberger, "Samuel und die Entstehung des isreelitischen Königtums," TZ, 1957, p. 453.). In 1 Samuel 8:7 we have Yahwe's appeal to Samuel, and here we find one of the reasons for the kingship of Saul: Yahwe seems to resign his kingship. He advises Samuel to give in to the wishes of the people, but he must warn them and show them the rights of a king. The second reason for the kingship is found in 8:20: Israel wants a king because it wants to be like all the other nations. The last reason is offered in 9:16. Here Yahwe himself is instituting the kingship, for he has seen the affliction of his people and has heard their cries. The crisis of the Philistines is here the direct cause of the kingship. This latter verse is found included in the story of the communal meal of the elders and Samuel. Samuel brings Saul and his servant to this meal and no one seems amazed or surprised. There was even the best meat already put aside for Saul. Even the cook was informed. If we may interpret this last trend of tradition as reflecting the establishment of the kingship in Israel, we may sum it up as follows: the Philistine threat forced the tribes to join their military might, because one or even a number of them could not stand the Philistines in a war. Samuel, in cooperation with the elders, anoints Saul a nagid of Israel; nothing is said of Samuel anointing Saul a king over Israel. Nagid has to be interpreted here as aspirant to the throne, not as king (cf. Wildberger, TZ, 1957, p. 454). The acclamation of the whole people makes the nagid Saul the king of Israel, after the defeat of Israel's enemies.

The Philistine threat against Israel was not a limited sort of war. The Philistines desired the conquest of all Israel. This made the Philistine threat different from all the other dangers. One tribe or a number of tribes were not able to resist this new and powerful enemy. The all-out effort of the combined tribes was necessary to prevent the Philistines from subduing the tribes. This may be the reason why Saul, the judge of Benjamin and Ephraim, "outgrew" the temporary charismatic leadership of the judges.

The kingship of Saul, however, was not a kingship like the kingship of surrounding nations. The king in Israel was the leader of the amphictyonic militia and hardly anything more. The kingship in Israel was understood to be very much like the authority of the judges, only on a larger scale, because the anointed remained king for life. However, the kingship in Israel was not heritable. Here the original charismatic character of the military leader was preserved. Yahwe would designate a new man when he was needed. Yahwe was the true protector of Israel, and the king was elected through the prophet of Yahwe. Later rulers in Israel were designated by a prophet and made king through the acclamation of the people in the same way as Saul was designated by Samuel and acclaimed by the people.[1]

---

[1] 1 Kings 11:29ff.; 12:20; 14:14; 15:27; 2 Kings 9:1ff.

The Philistine [illegible] against Israel was not a limited [illegible] of war. The Philistines [illegible] the conquest of all [illegible]. This made the Philistine threat different from all the other dangers. [illegible] a number of tribes were [illegible] to resist this new and powerful enemy. The all-out effort of the combined tribes was necessary to prevent the Philistines from conquering the land. This may be the reason [illegible] Saul, the judge of Benjamin and Ephraim, 'conquered' the temporary charismatic leadership of the judges.

The kingship of Saul, however, was not a kingship like the kingship of surrounding nations. The king in Israel was the leader of the [illegible] militia and hardly anything more. The kingship in Israel is understood to be very much like the authority of the judges, [illegible], the anointed remained king for life. [illegible], the kingship in Israel was not hereditary. Here the original charismatic character of the military leader was preserved. Yahweh [illegible] designated a new man when he was needed. Yahweh was the [illegible] protector of Israel, and the king was elected through the prophet of Yahweh. Later rulers in Israel were designated by a prophet and made king through the [illegible] of the people in the same way as Saul was designated [illegible] and [illegible] by the people.[1]

---

[1] [illegible]

In the course of tine, the idea of a kingship based on the free mobility of the charisma which could be revoked at any time by Yahwe, must necessarily come into conflict with the basic necessities of a kingship. Even in Israel the kingship necessarily must have outgrown the basis upon which it was founded. The task of a monarchy demanded continuity and the development of a strong institution which did not end with each ruler. This conflict between charisma and institution appeared early in Israel's royal history. The successor of Saul, David, still was a prophet-designated man, at least according to the tradition.[1]

The tradition of Samuel's anointing David may very well be a vaticinium ex eventu, a later prophetic legitimation of the Davidic monarchy. David was a mercenary, and originally there was probably no sacred legitimation to support his kingship.[2] David's accession to the throne of Israel came about through shrewd political maneuvers and his military ability. The change from charismatic kingship to institutional monarchy took place at that time. The kingship of Saul did not touch or influence the cultic life of the tribes, but under David the life of Israel experienced a fundamental change.

The kingship under David marks the change in Israel from charismatic kingship to institutional monarchy. It also

---

[1] 1 Samuel 16.

[2] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 44.

In the course of time, the [illegible] a [illegible] of the [illegible] required at any time by Solon, must necessarily [illegible] modified with the [illegible] of [illegible] probably [illegible] must have [illegible] which it was [illegible]. The task of [illegible] and the development of a common [illegible] with each other. [illegible] to the [illegible][1]

The [illegible] of [illegible] well [illegible] [illegible] marks the beginning of a certain secularization. For example, the protection of Israel had always been the sole responsibility of Yahwe, but now the kingship took this into its own management. It is true that Saul and even David still led holy wars, but basically the rise of the monarchy ended the sacred institution of the holy war. Already Saul, and after him David, introduced into the Israelite army mercenaries who frequently were non-Israelites.

---

[1] [illegible]

[illegible]

The custom of employing mercenaries was known in the Canaanite city-states.[1] David, especially, favored strategy based on bands of mercenaries which were more mobile and experienced than the amphictyonic militia.[2] For a while we find militia and mercenaries fighting side by side,[3] but the militia was used as reserve. Solomon went a step further in modeling his army after the example of the Canaanites and other nations. His favorite troop consisted of chariots, for which he established whole chariot cities.[4]

Compare the succession of David and Solomon to the throne, and the change in the kingship becomes apparent. When David died no new figure appeared at the political horizon, so David instituted his own successor. No mention is made of a

---

[1] 1 Samuel 14:52; 13:2.

[2] 2 Samuel 10:6-11,1; 12:26-31.

[3] 2 Samuel 11:11.

[4] 1 Kings 9:15, 17ff.

consultation of Yahwe or an acclamation of the people.

How weak this new type of kingship really was is attested by the events after the death of Solomon. These events showed that the Davidic monarchy had a strong grip only on Judah and Jerusalem. With the northern tribes David already had to make a special pact; with them he had to conclude a covenant which apparently granted the northern tribes special rights.[1] Under Solomon the northern tribes revolted and proposed the Ephraimite Jeroboam as king.

Strangely enough, here we find the continuation of the old pattern that a king should be designated by a prophet, acclaimed by the people. Ahia of Shiloh was the prophet who designated Jeroboam; after Rehoboam had refused to grant the covenantal rights to the northern tribes at the assembly at Shechem,[2] the people proclaimed Jeroboam king over Israel (meaning the northern tribes), leaving Jerusalem and Judah to the house of David. From then on there were two kingdoms with two different types of kingship. In the south, the Davidic dynasty stayed in power until the exile; for Jerusalem the dynastic bonds were inevitable. In the first place, the Jebusites did not know anything else, and in the second, Jerusalem belonged neither to Judah nor to Israel. The city was the "private" property of the house of David.

---

[1] 2 Samuel 5:3.

[2] 1 Kings 12.

In the north, in Israel, we find a number of kings who, according to the tradition, were charismatic kings. We hear about Jeroboam I, who received his position through designation by Yahwe and acclamation of the people. The same is true for Baesa, and possibly for Omri also, although the tradition about his ascension to the throne does not give any conclusive information.[1] Under Omri a dynasty is formed in Israel.

It may be as a result of the mobility of the charismatic kingship that only very hesitantly a royal city was established in Tirzah.[2] Under Omri this situation also changes. He purchased for his family the hill of Samaria and began to build on this hill a new capital, possibly after the example of Jerusalem, which also was the "purchase" of the family of David. We do not know what triggered this development in Israel. Alt thinks that the influence of the Canaanite aristocracy could be responsible for Omri's attempt to create a dynasty and to build a new capital.[3]

It may be, however, that the strength of Omri's kingship was able to support a dynasty for four generations like the strength of the kingship of David had supported the supremacy over the northern tribes for some time after his death. Omri did not pick one of the existing Canaanite cities but

---

[1] 1 Kings 16:15ff. Cf. also Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 121.

[2] 1 Kings 14:17; 15:21,33.

[3] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 123.

started building on an uninhabited hill. Omri had purchased this hill; David had conquered his capital. In Jerusalem, the Jebusites remained in the city and influenced the development of the Davidic monarchy; in Israel, Israelites occupied Samaria and the kingship there never even approaches the particular character of the Davidic monarchy.

The remarkable thing is that the dynasty of Omri did not impress the Israelites so much; in due time another man, designated by a prophet, arose in Israel. Jehu exterminated the house of Omri[1] and founded a dynasty himself which lasted for four generations.

The Yahwe-legitimated revolutions prevented any real continuity in Israel. Therefore the monarchy never developed as sturdily as in Judah, where the king had a strong position in his city of Jerusalem and among the people of Judah. We do not hear of any interruption of the Davidic monarchy, but attempts had been made to dispose of the house of David. Always, however, the surviving prince had the backing of the '*am ha 'arez*, the people of the country, the assembly of the Judean full citizens.[2] The difference between north and south, then, would be that in the south there was no emphasis on *charisma* and prophetic designation, but on the continuity of the present dynasty. In both parts of the country, however, the people played an important role. The major difference between Israel and Judah must have been due to influence of Jerusalem traditions.

---

[1] 2 Kings 9; 10.

[2] 2 Kings 21:24; 23:30.

The Royal Traditions of Jerusalem

The beginning of the Davidic kingship in Jerusalem. The first time we hear about Jerusalem is in Genesis 14:8. This tradition refers to a King Melchizedek of Shalem.[1] The remarkable thing about this Melchizedek in the eyes of the Israelites must have been that he combined his royal functions with priestly duties.[2] We are not sure to what ethnic group this Melchizedek belonged. Usually in Old Testament traditions the Canaanite people of Jerusalem are Jebusites.[3] The etymology of Jebus has not yet been explained. It may be of Hurrian origin, but the royal names of the ruling class in Shalem may indicate Semitic (Amorite) origin.[4]

---

[1] Scholars generally agree that the name Shalem is identical with the name Jerusalem. Noth, *ZTK*, 1950, p. 183; Widengren, *op. cit.*, p. 47; and E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 324ff. for example. Genesis 14:18ff. should not be considered genuine old Israelite tradition; Genesis 14:18 is the only time the name Jerusalem occurs in the Pentateuch. We have to conclude that essentially the traditions in the Pentateuch have been formed in pre-monarchical time and that the literary fixation did not change them too much. Another conclusion is that Jerusalem was not at all rooted in Israelite tradition (cf. Noth, *ZTK*, 1950, p. 173.).

[2] Psalm 110:4.

[3] Joshua 15:63; Judges 1:21; 2 Samuel 5:6,8; Judges 19-21 even calls the city Jebus in 19:10, but the words may be considered an insertion. Cf. E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

[4] See the names Adoni-Zedek in Joshua 10:1ff.; Melchizedek in Genesis 14:8 (E. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 327). Nielsen considers 1 Kings 12:25ff. an indirect reference to bull worship in Jerusalem.

As late as Ezekiel we find the knowledge of the non-Israelite background of Jerusalem: "Thus says the Lord God to Jerusalem: By origin and birth you belong to the land of the Canaanites. Your father was an Amorite and your mother a Hittite...".[1] The element shalem in the name Jerusalem evidences the pre-Israelite existence of the city. Shalem is a West-Semitic deity. After David conquered the city shalem appears as a theophorous element in the names of two princes, Solomon and Absalom. It is significant that the sons of David which were born in Hebron bore Yahwistic names, while none of those born in Jerusalem bears a Yahwistic name.[2]

We do not know for sure what kind of government David found in Jerusalem when he conquered the city. Joshua 10 and Judges 1 seem to indicate that Jerusalem was a royal city in that period.[3] On the other hand, we hear nothing about a king in connection with the conquest.[4] David apparently adopted the royal traditions of Jerusalem. He considered himself a priest, as we shall see later, and of course he was king. The reference to the king-priest "after the

---

[1] Ezekiel 16:3.

[2] Widengren, op. cit., p. 47.

[3] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 329.

[4] 2 Samuel 5. The Tell el-Amarna letters mention a prince Abdu-Heba of Jerusalem for the time c. 1350 B.C. (cf. ANET, pp. 487f.).

order of Melchizedek"[1] made scholars assume that Zadok, who became the priest of David, in reality was the last Amorite king of Jerusalem.[2] The idea of the sacral kingship came to Israel via Jerusalem. David stepped into the traditions which he found after having conquered the city.[3]

In theory, Jerusalem belonged to the land of the tribe of Benjamin.[4] Benjamin, however, did not have the military strength to conquer the city.[5] Until David conquered the city it remained an enclave in the tribal territory.[6] David was king of Judah, Israel, and Jerusalem; a correct description had to mention Jerusalem and Judah separately.[7] When David made Jerusalem his royal city and capital, he withdrew the monarchy from tribal influence and founded it on his own ground. Nevertheless the Davidic monarchy had the support of the southern tribes.

These facts explain the almost unchanging picture of the monarchy in the south. We never hear of Yahwe taking the initiative so that a prophet or other "man of God" designates a new man for the throne. Never do we hear of group of 'Hrishtenes'[1] were conquered regions that David, who beyond the extent of Israel, in reality was the last north king of Jerusalem.[2] The [illegible] of the several kingship was to Israel via Jerusalem. [illegible] adopted into the tradition which he found [illegible] concerning the city.[4]

---

[1] Psalm 110:4.

[2] E. Nielsen, _op_. _cit_., p. 329; Widengren, _op_. _cit_., p. 47.

[3] Hempel, _ZAW_, LXV (1953), p. 143.

[4] Joshua 15:8; 18:16.

[5] Judges 1:21.

[6] Judges 1:8 is historically unprobable (cf. Schmid, _ZAW_, LXVII (1955), p. 174.

[7] Isaiah 1:1; 2:1; 3:1,8; 5:3, etc.

In theory, Jerusalem belonged to the land of the tribe of Benjamin.[5] Benjamin, however, did not have the military strength to conquer the city. [illegible] David conquered the city it remained [illegible] possession.[6] David was [illegible] of Judah, [illegible] correct [illegible] not to mention Jerusalem [illegible] separately.[7] [illegible] Jerusalem [illegible] royal city [illegible] outside, he withdrew the conquest [illegible] founded it on his own [illegible] special [illegible] and the support of the [illegible] tribes.

[illegible]

of the movement in the south. [illegible] of Yahweh [illegible] the inhabitants so that a prophet or other [illegible] designates a [illegible] for the throne. [illegible] a rebellion among the southern tribes against the house of David. But we do hear - and this shows the particularity of the city of Jerusalem - about conspiracies against the Davidic monarchy which originated in Jerusalem, at the king's court.[1] As soon as the 'am ha'arez, the people of Judah, heard that the rightful king of the throne of David had been removed by his slaves, they streamed into the city and forced the enthronement of the rightful heir.[2]

---

[1] Ibid. [illegible]

[2] A. Alt, *op. cit.*, p. [illegible]; [illegible], *op. cit.*

[3] [illegible], *[illegible]*, LXV (19[illegible]), p. [illegible].

[4] [illegible]

[5] Ibid.

[6] [illegible] (Ph.D. [illegible]), *[illegible]*, LXVII (19[illegible]), p. 17[illegible].

What were the means through which David achieved the stability of the monarchy in the south? We shall devote the rest of our treatment of the monarchy to answering this question. We will begin by investigating the cult which David found in Jerusalem when he conquered the city. We hear that Melchizedek was the priest of El 'Elyon.[3] Schmid holds that 2 Samuel 24 is the hieros logos of the Jerusalemite Yahwe sanctuary.[4] Behind the angel stands El 'Elyon. Schmid also suggests that the element zedek in the theophorous name Melchizedek indicates that zedek was a title of El 'Elyon.[5] Noth, however, denies that zedek is the numen in name Melchizedek;[6] we would suggest that melek instead of a rebellion among the people, and to [illegible] the house of David, [illegible] - and [illegible] the peculiarity of the site of Jerusalem - [illegible] against the Davidic monarchy which originated in Jerusalem, at the death [illegible].[1] As soon as [illegible], the people of Judah, however, that the [illegible] of the throne of David had been removed [illegible], they [illegible] from the city and [illegible].

---

[1] 2 Kings 11; 12:21ff.; 14:19; 21:23.

[2] 2 Kings 14:21; 21:24; 23:20; 11:20a.

[3] Psalm 110; Genesis 14.

[4] Schmid, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 175.

[5] Ibid., p. 177.

[6] Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen..., p. 161.

[illegible] the stability of the monarchy [illegible] the root of our [illegible] question. We will [illegible] David found in Jerusalem [illegible]. We hear that Melchizedek was king of [illegible].[2] [illegible] holds that 2 [illegible] the Jerusalemite Jebus sanctuary.[3] [illegible] should [illegible] in the [illegible] are [illegible] Smith, however, [illegible] in the [illegible] of Melchizedek;[5] [illegible] zedek is a title for El 'Elyon.

---

[1] 2 Kings 11; [illegible]

[2] [illegible] 14:21; [illegible]

[3] [illegible] 110; [illegible]

[4] [illegible]

[5] Ibid., p. 177.

[6] Smith, op. cit. [illegible]

Jerusalem does not have a fathers tradition. When Abraham and Melchizedek come together it is not in or near Jerusalem. Abraham gives the tenth to Melchizedek and thus to El 'Elyon. Afterwards Abraham swears by Yahwe El 'Elyon,[1] who is the creator of heaven and earth.[2] The old tradition did not seem to consider El 'Elyon a competitor of Yahwe. What else do we know about El 'Elyon? The tradition of the chaos battle in Psalm 46:2-6 mentions the name El 'Elyon. This tradition probably came to Israel via Jerusalem. Because El lives in Jerusalem the city does not topple when the power of chaos storms against it.[3] That Yahwe soon was identified with El in Jerusalem is shown by a pre-exilic hymn which has its origin in Jerusalem: "Yahwe, your adversaries shall be dismayed; El 'Elyon in heaven shall thunder at them."[4] Yahwe is here parallel to El 'Elyon.

---

[1] Genesis 14:22.

[2] See the previous section on El.

[3] Psalm 46:3f. and Amos 1:2a.

[4] 1 Samuel 2:10a (See the preceding 10 verses also.) Cf. Schmid, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 183. In S.H. Hooke (ed.), Myth and Ritual (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), pp. 87ff., F.J. Hollis cites evidence of the influence of solar worship in some Israelite tribes and among the Jebusites before the soldiers of David conquered them. Here it is stated that the tribe of Benjamin, which lived in Egypt in close proximity to the temples, was devoted to the rituals of the sun god. The tribe had been known earlier under the name Benoni, and On was the ancient name of the city of the sun, Heliopolis. Hollis then turns to the tribe of Manasseh, which he considers a champion of the Babylonian sun cult. Names like Beth-Shemesh add further evidence. The Philistines considered Beth-Shemesh as the original home of the ark

Between Psalm 137 and the statement that Jerusalem was not rooted in Israelite tradition lie four hundred years. It is clear that something had changed. David was responsible for this change. He did two things for Jerusalem. His political cunning and ability showed him the strategic position of the Jebusite city. He conquered it and made it his royal city. David knew, however, that this city in the eyes of the Israelite tribes had no legitimation and therefore probably no future. The amphictyonic cult tied the tribes together in the worship of the same god, Yahwe. The central sanctuary was the sanctuary where the ark was located, and there all Israel came to worship. Consequently, David brought up the ark into the city of the Jebusites and thus provided the cult in Jerusalem with a Yahwistic foundation and legitimation. David thus bound the tribes to his city and therefore to himself also. Moving the ark to Jerusalem

---

(1 Samuel 6:8). Solar elements underlie the legends around Samson. Finally, the Jebusites were devotees of the sun. Then too, Jerusalem was located in the territory of Benjamin. If Hollis were correct, the sun would have been the most important deity in the near east, her reign covering Babylon, Palestine, and Egypt. Why does Hollis feel it necessary to make the Benjaminites sun-worshippers, if the Jebusites were already worshipping the sun, which would give enough support to his thesis. Furthermore, we have no evidence of any connection between Jerusalem and Benjamin. The fact that the city was located in Benjaminite territory did not mean anything after the conquest. What about the good evidence for El 'Elyon as the deity of Jerusalem? This god is much better attested to in Palestine mythology than is a sun god. (Cf. for this the Ras Shamra tablets, etc.) Hollis does not even bother to discuss a possible relationship between El and a sun god.

Between [illegible] and the statement that Jerusalem was not rooted in Israelite tradition [illegible] several years. It is clear that something [illegible] changed. David was responsible for this change. He did two things for Jerusalem. His political acumen [illegible] showed him the strategic condition of the Jebusite city. He conquered it and made it the royal city. David knew, however, that this city in the eyes of the Israelite tribes had no legitimation and [illegible] probably no future. The amphictyonic [illegible] the tribes together in the worship of [illegible] Yahweh. This central sanctuary was the sanctuary where the ark [illegible], and there all Israel came to worship. Consequently, David brought up the ark into the city of the Jebusites and thus provided the cult in Jerusalem with a Yahwistic [illegible] and legitimation. David thus joined the [illegible] [illegible] to himself also. Moving the ark to [illegible]

(1 [illegible] ibid.). [illegible] elements underlie the [illegible] Samuel. [illegible], the [illegible] were devoted [illegible] [illegible] was located in the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] the sun [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] were already [illegible] the [illegible] would have [illegible] to his thesis. Furth[illegible] of any connection between Jerusalem [illegible] the city was located [illegible]

[illegible] (cf. for this the [illegible] tablets, etc.) [illegible] relation- [illegible] and a sun god.

was an action of questionable legitimacy, however.

Legally David was the successor of the city kings of Jerusalem and as such had cultic rights and functions. In the amphictyonic cult of the Israelite tribes, the king of the states Israel and Judah did not necessarily have any function. By bringing the Ark to Jerusalem,[1] over which David as city king was lord, the king had placed himself in the amphictyonic cult which was connected with the ark. The result of this was the merger of the traditional Israelite cult of the ark with the political institution of the Davidic monarchy in Jerusalem.[2] The ties of the tribes with the ark were so strong that even after the political schism of Israel and Judah the ark was still considered the cultic center of the tribes.

It is strange that only the Davidic kings in Jerusalem considered the schism as faithlessness of Israel.[3] We do not hear any corresponding complaint from the northern kingdom, Israel. The north found its essence not in an the sanction of [illegible], however.

---

[1] 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 6 have the purpose of establishing the continuity between the old and new central shrine of Israel. The report of the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem should not be regarded only as singular historical event but also as the ceremony of a feast which was celebrated annually in Jerusalem. The other report, 1 Kings 8 (cf. Psalm 132 also), shows the same basic outline. Cf. Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 53.

[2] Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 175. The shrine at Jerusalem was, as royal sanctuary, the site of the official cult. As location of the ark, it was the central (amphictyonic) cult place of Israel.

[3] 1 Kings 12:19; Isaiah 7:17.

[illegible] Secondly David was the successor of the city kings of Jerusalem and as such [illegible] the [illegible] and functions. In the amphictyony of the Israelite tribes, the king of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] have the function. [illegible] [illegible] Jerusalem, [illegible] David as [illegible] the [illegible], the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] which was [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]. The result of this was [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] Israelite cult of the [illegible] [illegible] the political institution of the Davidic monarchy in Jerusalem. - The ties of the [illegible] with [illegible] were so strong that even after the political schism of Israel and Judah [illegible] was still considered the [illegible] of the tribes.

It [illegible] seems that only the [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] selves considered the schism as faithlessness [illegible][3] we do not have any corresponding complaint from the northern kingdom, [illegible]. The north found its [illegible] in [illegible]

---

[1] [illegible] I Samuel 4-6 [illegible] 2 Samuel 6 [illegible] the [illegible] purpose of establishing the continuity between the old [illegible] and [illegible] shrine of Israel. The [illegible] of the [illegible] of the [illegible] Jerusalem could not be [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] Th[illegible], p. [illegible].

[2] Noth, Geschichte Israels, p. 177. [illegible] Jerusalem was, [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the ark, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] central place of Israel.

[3] [illegible] [illegible]; Isaiah 7:17.

identification with its monarchy, but in its existence as covenantal people. The monarchy was here merely a necessary evil; the break with the house of David posed no dilemma as long as the worship of Yahwe was secured. The all-Israelite attitude of Deuteronomy has its roots here. Israel was not the kingdoms or states of Judah and Israel, but consisted of the people of Yahwe.

The Zadokite priests. Zadok the priest appears suddenly under David. He is always mentioned without the name of his father, which indicates that he was a homo novus,[1] or without inherited legitimacy. Did the tradition try to conceal the possible Canaanite background of this man? We do not know for certain where Zadok came from or what his background was. Mowinckel and Rowley tried to solve this problem through the thesis that Zadok was Jerusalem's last priest-king, who was defeated by David but left in his priestly office.[2] This thesis is very impressive and is indirectly supported by the fact that throughout the traditions we find Zadok or the Zadokites connected with the sanctuary in Jerusalem.[3] In 2 Kings 2:35 Zadok is the priestly support for the succession of Solomon to the throne while the other priest, Abiathar, supports Adonijah. When Solomon gains the supremacy he dismisses Abiathar to his

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 247.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 174.

[illegible] with the [illegible], but in its relations [illegible] covenantal good. The [illegible] a [illegible] well, the [illegible] the [illegible] as long as the [illegible]. The [illegible] Israel's [illegible] of [illegible]. Israel was not the [illegible] of [illegible], but constituted of the peoples of [illegible].

The [illegible]. [illegible] surface [illegible], which [illegible] of [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] by the [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] by the [illegible] tions of [illegible] the [illegible] sanctuary in Jerusalem,[3] [illegible] support for the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Jeremiah, [illegible]

home in Anatoth.[1] From then on we may infer that the Zadokites were in sole control of the Jerusalemite priesthood.

Later the priest of the temple in Jerusalem, together with the nobility, appear as the enemies of the prophet Jeremiah.[2] Ezekiel seems to know of only Zadokites as priests in Jerusalem.[3] However, he calls the Zadokites in Jerusalem Levites when he says that all Levites who descended from Zadok shall be priests and those who are not shall cease to be priests.[4]

Zion and Jerusalem the chosen city. The *hieros logos* of the Davidic shrine at Jerusalem is found in 2 Samuel 24. David chose the threshing floor of Araunah as the site for his sanctuary. Araunah belonged to the native population of Jerusalem and was a Jebusite. The text in 2 Samuel 24 emphasizes that this location had never been a cult place before. An encounter with the angel of the Lord caused the

---

[1] 1 Kings 2:26.

[2] Jeremiah 1:18; 4:9; 13:13; 6:13; 18:18; 20:1-6.

[3] Ezekiel 44:15.

[4] Here certainly the deuteronomic appreciation of the Levitical priesthood is to be made responsible for this harmonization. Levites are supposed to be *the* priests, but the fact is that in Jerusalem Zadokites are priests. Ezekiel harmonized the historical fact with the deuteronomic demand. The realization of the deuteronomic reform as according to Deuteronomy seems to have been opposed by a powerful group. Alt, *Kleine Schriften*, II, p. 256, is certainly right in supposing that this group is identified with the priesthood of the Jerusalem temple who did not want to share their

erection of an altar. In 1 Chronicles 21 even more than in 2 Samuel 24 the theophany legitimates this site as a cult place. David buys the threshing floor from Araunah. The transaction between David and the Jebusite Araunah symbolizes the historical events. In a demythologized form, 2 Samuel 24 offers the adoption of the old cult place of El 'Elyon.[1] What previously belonged to the Jebusites was annexed by David.

The tradition of 2 Samuel 24, however, is only half of the picture. It established the legitimate use of the old Jebusite cult place because the angel of the Lord appeared here to David, but this did not make the former "threshing floor" superior to other sanctuaries all around the country. They had all become Yahwe sanctuaries through theophanies, some of them already through the fathers.[2]

Therefore, we have to look for the second half of the hieros logos. We find it in 2 Samuel 6, when David brought the ark of the Lord to Jerusalem. In the center of this text stands the house of David, the Davidic monarchy, not David alone. The text reports the motivation of moving

---

inherited rights with anyone else (see the following section on Deuteronomy). After the exile, when Ezra came, he brought Zadokites with him. From then on the Zadokites (later known as Sadducees) were priests in Jerusalem.

[1] For the sacred character of threshing-floors see Hosea 9, where the threshing floor is connected with the fertility cult.

[2] Cf. Bethel in Genesis 13:3ff., Beersheba in Genesis 21:32f., and Mamre in Genesis 12:6ff.

sanctity of an altar. [illegible]

In 2 Samuel 21 the [illegible]

cultic place. [illegible]

The presentation [illegible]

symbolizes the tabernacle [illegible]. In a [illegible],

2 Samuel 24 [illegible] the [illegible]

of Hebron. [illegible]

same [illegible].

The [illegible] 2 [illegible],

call of [illegible]. [illegible] the [illegible]

the old [illegible]

presence [illegible] to David, [illegible]

"threshing floor" [illegible]

the country. They [illegible]

theocratic, [illegible]

Therefore, we have to look [illegible]

the [illegible]. [illegible]

brought the ark of the Lord to Jerusalem. At the [illegible]

this tent stands the house of God, [illegible]

not stand alone. The [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] with [illegible]

[illegible]) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] in [illegible]

the ark: "The Lord had blessed the house of Obed-edom and all that belonged to him, because of the ark of God..."[1] Further down in verse 21 the reference to the election of the house of David as in contrast to the rejection of the house of Saul points out the reason for bringing up the ark.[2]

The dynasty of David is chosen by Yahwe and authorized to continue the amphictyonic cult in Jerusalem.[3] Every year at the feast of booths[4] from that time on, the ark, and on it Yahwe, were brought to the temple on Mount Zion.[5] The feast of booths was the feast of the renewal of the covenant, and the events of Mount Sinai were re-enacted. The ceremony included the presentation of the events at Mount Sinai, the proclamation of the covenantal law, the concluding of the covenant, blessing and curse.[6] Kraus says that these events of the feast of booths were not at all influenced by the new Zion festival, they only fit into one another well.[7]

---

[1] 2 Samuel 6:12.

[2] The dedication of the Solomonic shrine has much the same significance (cf. 1 Kings 8).

[3] 2 Samuel 7; 1 Kings 8.

[4] 1 Kings 8:2.

[5] Hans-Joachim Kraus, Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1951), pp. 44f.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

If it is true that the old and new feast merged and formed a unit, then we have to oppose Kraus when he says that the feast of booths was not influenced by the Zion feast at all. We have seen that the main emphasis in the Zion feast was the choice of the house of David, which - in possession of the ark - possessed the blessing of the Lord. We shall see later that the content of the feast of booths as an amphictyonic festival was changed through the new Zion festival.

The ark lost its original character of being the mobile center of the tribes; it became the throne of Yahwe and the covenant lost its meaning in so far as not Israel (Judah) was chosen but the house of David. When Yahwe chose Jerusalem as his dwelling place he chose the house of David. From then on Zion/Jerusalem and the house of David belonged so close together that they were almost interchangable. Psalm 132 understands the choice of Zion as being Yahwe's choice as well as the Davidic kingship was. Yahwe's throne stands on Zion and thus the throne of the house of David stands here also. The throne of Yahwe and the throne of David are almost one.[1]

The institution of the kingship under David and Solomon which was connected with the erection of the royal national sanctuary in Jerusalem, furthered the same process which we know occurred in Babylon and Assur where Marduk and

---

[1] Psalm 110:1; 78; cf. also von Rad, Theologie..., p. 54.

Assur, the national deities, were worshipped as creators of the world. The chosen people were the center of the world. In Israel it was the amphictyony of the twelve tribes; in Assur and Babylon the country and city were the chosen people. The election of Israel as the amphictyony did not play an essential role, for the election was centered on Jerusalem and the house of David. In fact, the idea of Israel as the chosen people seems to be a post-exilic transformation of the idea of Jerusalem and David as objects of election. Zion is the name of Jerusalem, being the seat of the house of David and the throne of Yahwe.

Possibly the oldest Zion hymn is Exodus 15.[1] The center of this hymn is verse 18. Its origin may have been during the time of Solomon.[2] Jerusalem was the political and religious center of the world, and gathering point of the nations. The cultic locus for the celebration of Yahwe as king of the nations and of Zion as the elected dwelling

---

[1] Walter Staerk, "Zum alttestamentlichen Erwählungsglauben," ZAW, LV (1937), p. 23.

[2] Ibid. Cf. also Georg Beer, Exodus (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1939); the complete establishment of Zion as the sole and supreme sanctuary must have taken place during the reign of Solomon. In 1 Kings 3:4ff. (and Chronicles 1ff.) the old bamah Gibeon still seems to be the most important cult place. Solomon conducts his first great official action (cf. Staerk, ZAW, LV (1937), p. 30) not at the new cult place but at a place of greater sanctity. In the beginning of the reign of Solomon we find strong competition between, for example, the Yahwe cult in Jerusalem and in Gibeon. The building of the temple later on must have given the undisputed superiority to Jerusalem (where the official cult was concerned).

[illegible], the nations' [illegible], were worshipped as creators of the world. The chosen people were the center of the world. In Israel it was the sanctuary of the twelve tribes; in Judah [illegible] the chosen people. The election of Israel as the amphictyony did not play an essential role, for the election was centered on Jerusalem and the house of David. In fact, the idea of Israel as the chosen people seems to be a [illegible] transformation of the idea of Jerusalem and David as objects of election. Zion is the seat of Yahweh, being the seat of the house of David and the throne of Yahweh.

Possibly the oldest Zion hymn is Psalm 132.[1] The center of this hymn is verse 13. The psalm may have been [illegible] during the time of Solomon.[2] Jerusalem was the political and religious center of the world, and ruling [illegible] of the nations. The cultic locus for the veneration of Yahweh as king of the nations and of Zion as the chosen dwelling place of Yahwe is the procession of the ark. Psalm 47 reflects the bringing of the ark up to Jerusalem/Zion.[1] The holy throne of God (v.8) is the ark upon which Yahwe was thought to ride up to his house on Zion. The expression "he is seated upon the cherubim"[2] says the same thing. All the people are asked to worship God, for Yahwe 'Elyon is terrible.[3] 'Elyon has become a surname of Yahwe.[4] The procession of the ark to Zion was an annual festival.[5] Sitting on the ark, Yahwe has taken residence on Mount Zion "the joy of the whole earth".[6] Zion was the main center of the world,[7] or the navel of the earth.[8] Another Psalm witnesses the procession of Yahwe on the ark as it is borne up to Mount Zion.[9]

---

[1] [illegible], "[illegible]," ZAW, [illegible] ([illegible]), p. 73.

[2] [illegible]

Because Yahwe is the universal king, the superiority of his chosen people is guaranteed. The kings of the earth who oppose the sovereignty of Yahwe are defeated and held captive.[10] The picture of the great king holding his enemies

---

[1] עלה is a technical term for the procession of the ark. Cf. 2 Samuel 6:2ff., 1 Kings 8:4ff., and Schmid, *ZAW*, LXVII (1955), p. 185.

[2] Psalm 99:1.

[3] Psalm 47:1,2.

[4] Psalm 97:9.

[5] Von Rad, *Theologie...*, p. 53; cf. 1 Kings 8; Psalm 132.

[6] Psalm 48:2; Psalm 76:1ff.

[7] Psalm 48:2.

[8] Ezekiel 38:12.

[9] Psalm 24; 29. Cf. Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 64f.

[10] Psalm 68;19ff.; 48.

captive is known from the inscriptions of the victorious kings in Egypt and Babylon. The Lord is a warrior god who is returning in triumph to his house.[1] The enemies are those who have opposed and envied the Mountain of God, Zion.[2] Zion is the hill in the far north, a description which is usually used for the location of the royal throne of Aleyan Baal.[3]

According to Isaiah 14:12ff., Zaphon is situated upon the Mount of Assembly, where Elyon is enthroned in the midst of his heavenly host.[4] Aleyan Baal, who is also called Baal Zaphon, is the lord of the mountain in the north, according to Ugaritic texts. Zion has thus adopted the features of the mountain in the far north which was connected with Baal. Yahwe steps into the person of Baal and Zion becomes Zaphon. Another equality of Zion and Zaphon is the river "whose streams make glad the city of God..."[5], which is the habitation of Elyon. In later prophecies also the city of God is connected with a stream.[6]

In Ugaritic traditions El dwells on a mountain, from which the two streams nrhm and two floods thmtm originate.[7]

---

[1] Psalm 24:7ff.

[2] Psalm 68:16ff.

[3] Psalm 48:2.

[4] Schmid, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 188.

[5] Psalm 46:4.

[6] Jeremiah 33:20f.; Joshua 4:18; Zechariah 14:8.

[7] Schmid, ZAW, LXVII (1957), p. 187.

It appears that the mountain of God in Jerusalem was understood in a similar way. The streams, however, are not found in Jerusalem. It may be possible according to Ugaritic terminology to understand "under the נהרים" in Psalm 46:4 as the subterranean sources of water which surface as different springs like the Rogel well[1] and the Gihon well.[2]

It is clear that a great amount of the Zion tradition is pre-Israelite Canaanite tradition and only secondarily transferred to Zion.[3] During the course of history Jerusalem became the sanctuary. It was the place of the presence of Yahwe. The Zion theology developed into a theology of the holy place, suggesting for Zion/Jerusalem a particular and almost material holiness. This quality is limited to the central sanctuary and to Jerusalem as the sanctuary's location on earth.[4] Thus it was possible that after the catastrophe of 587 which ended the role of Jerusalem as royal city of the house of David, and after the destruction of temple and ark, which probably burnt in the disaster,[5] Jerusalem with its "holy mountain" could remain the center for those Israelites who preserved the old traditions both in the exile and at home.

---

[1] 1 Kings 1:9. The serpent stone at the Rogel well belonged apparently to the sacred objects of pre-Israelite Jerusalem (cf. E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 330.).

[2] 1 Kings 1:33.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 55.

[4] Exodus 28:43; 35:19; 39:1,41; Numbers 28:7; Leviticus 10:13,17, etc.

[5] Jeremiah 39:8.

It seeming that the [illegible]

undoubtedly in [illegible], however, are not

found in Jerusalem. It may be possible [illegible] to [illegible]

familiarity to [illegible] in [illegible]

on the southern [illegible]

such [illegible] like the [illegible].

[illegible]

is [illegible]

transformed to [illegible]

[illegible] constitutes. [illegible]

[illegible]. The [illegible]

holy places, [illegible]

almost material holiness. [illegible]

central [illegible]

on earth. [illegible] that it was possible then [illegible]

of [illegible]

[illegible]

which [illegible]

compared the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible], 10:13, etc.

[illegible]

Titles and Roles of the Jerusalem King:
Priest, Anointed, Ebed, Righteous, Chosen, Son, God

Priest. In our discussion of Melchizedek, the ancient priest-king of Shalem, we have already indicated that David and his successors adopted the position of the Jebusite priest-king. They stepped into the practice of cultic functions as kings of Jerusalem. Essentially those priestly functions are limited to the Davidic kings in Jerusalem, which supports the foregoing thesis.[1] The location of the ark in Jerusalem makes it probable that the king functioned as priest before the ark. This made the cultic functions of the Jerusalem king valid not only for the city of Jerusalem but also for "Israel". The personal union between the city state Jerusalem and the state Judah lasted so long that, at least for Judah, the cultic functions of the king became determinative.

The cultic functions of the king in Jerusalem begin with David, who apparently had a priestly part in the procession of the ark up to Mount Zion.[2] The dance which David performed on that occasion may be interpreted as a

---

[1] 1 Samuel 13 reflects an attitude which condemns the priestly functions of the king. Saul "illegally" sacrificed and this marks the beginning of the end. Even if Noth is right in saying that this is a secondary explanation of the disruption between Saul and Samuel, the tradition is still significant as opposing the priestly functions of the king. It is not accidental that this opposition is connected with a charismatic king, Saul (cf. Noth, ZTK, 1950, p. 185.).

[2] 2 Samuel 6:14ff.

Titles and Power of the Jerusalem King:

Priest, Anointed, Lord, Shepherd, [illegible], Son, God

[illegible] earliest priest-king of Salem, we have already indicated that David and his successors assumed the position of the Jebusite priest-kings. They attempted the practice of cultic functions at shrines of Jerusalem. Significantly these priestly functions are limited to the Davidic king in Jerusalem, which supports the foregoing thesis.[1] The location of the Ark in Jerusalem makes it probable that the city I mentioned as present before the [illegible]. This means the cultic functions of the Jerusalem king would not only be for the city of Jerusalem but also for Israel. The personal union between the city state Jerusalem and the state [illegible] tended to lose that, at least for Judah, the cultic functions of the king became determinative.

The cultic functions of the king in Jerusalem begin with David, who apparently had a cultic part in the procession of the Ark up to Mount Zion.[2] The dance which David performed on that occasion may be interpreted as a

---

1) Samuel [illegible] reflects an [illegible] which confirms the priestly function of the king. [illegible] "literally" priestly, and this marks the emphasis in the [illegible]. Noth is right in saying that this is a [illegible] expression of the connection between [illegible] and Israel, the tradition is still [illegible] as to the priestly function of the king. It is not [illegible] that [illegible] a charismatic king, Saul (cf. [illegible], ZAW, [illegible], p. [illegible]).

2) [illegible]

cultic function.[1] The king is clad in a priestly vestment, the linen apron.[2] David also offers the sacrifices and blesses the people.[3] The king was not only the supreme cultic functionary but also lord over the temple and priesthood. Abiathar is dismissed by Solomon from priestly duties in the Jerusalem shrine.[4] Rehoboam institutes priests which were not Levites at the high places.[5] In the northern kingdom we find Ahab erecting an altar to Baal.[6] On the other hand, some kings broke down the altars of the foreign deities.[7]

It is remarkable that after the downfall of the Davidic monarchy the prophet Ezekiel considers the cultic functions of the king so important that he expected a future "prince" to inherit those functions.[8] This "prince" never appeared, and the cultic functions were inherited by the post-exilic high priest.

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 112. 2 Samuel 6:5; Psalm 42:5; 87:7; 150:4. The dance is a means of achieving ecstasy in 1 Samuel 10:5f. and 2 Kings 3:15.

[2] 2 Samuel 6:14; Exodus 28:4; 39:1ff.; Psalm 110; 29:2; 96:9.

[3] 2 Samuel 6:17f.; cf. also Numbers 6:22-27.

[4] 1 Kings 2:26.

[5] 1 Kings 12:31f.

[6] 1 Kings 16:32f. This does not mean, however, that the northern king played anything like the cultic role of the king in Jerusalem.

[7] 2 Kings 18:4ff.; 22:4ff.

[8] Ezekiel 40-48. Cf. Noth, ZTK, 1950, p. 178.

cultic function.[1] Th[illegible] is a [illegible]ly [illegible],
the Hiram [illegible].[2] [illegible] among the [illegible] the
the people.[3] The [illegible] the [illegible] cultic func-
tionary [illegible] , [illegible]-
tory is [illegible] in the
Jerusalem [illegible].[4] [illegible] which were
not Levites [illegible]. In the northern kingdom,
we find [illegible],
some [illegible], [illegible] of the [illegible].[5]

It is [illegible] of the
Davidic [illegible], the [illegible] the cultic
function of the king [illegible]
"cultic" [illegible] "cultic" [illegible]
[illegible], and the [illegible]
[illegible].

---

[1] [illegible]

[2] [illegible]

[3] [illegible]

[4] [illegible]

[5] [illegible]

Anointed. In instituting a king the important act was not his crowning but his anointing. This term is always used by the Hebrews.[1] The king therefore is called "the anointed" (Messiah is משיח), or the "anointed of Yahwe".[2] Yahwe himself is said to anoint the king.[3] In "reality" the priest conducts the anointing in Yahwe's stead and in his name.[4] Sometimes the people anoint, as for example when the men of Judah anointed David king of Judah.[5]

Anointing a king as the sign of his designation and his installation into royal authority seems to have been a cultic rite familiar to the ancient Near East. Johnson points out that the Amarna letters report the rite of anointing in the 14th century B.C.[6] The significance of anointing is made clear through the fact that the ark, tent, cultic instruments, and stones were anointed.[7] Through anointing these objects assumed cultic significance, that is they became holy and were separated from the rest of similar objects because of cultic use. They belonged to the deity in whose service they were used. In Israel the anointed

---

[1] Judges 9:15; 1 Kings 19:15.

[2] 1 Samuel 24:7,11; 26:9ff.; 2 Samuel 1:14; 1:16; 19:22; 23:1; Psalm 18:51, etc.

[3] Psalm 89:21.

[4] 1 Samuel 10:1; 2 Kings 9:6.

[5] 2 Samuel 2:4; cf. also 2:7; 5:3; 5:17; 19:11; 1 Kings 5:15; 2 Kings 11:12; 23:30.

[6] Johnson, op. cit., p. 12.

[7] Genesis 3:13; 28:22.

of Yahwe was an "untouchable". "Destroy him not; for who can lay his hand upon the Lord's anointed and be innocent?"[1] The cursing of a king could be accounted the same as the cursing of Yahwe.[2]

Another result of the anointing of the king was that the king became a channel of the spirit (רוח) of Yahwe. We know that Saul[3] and David[4] were seized by the spirit of Yahwe in connection with their rise to the kingship. It seems that anointing as a rite later carried with itself automatically the bestowal of the spirit.[5] Thus the old charismatic qualities of the judges and the first two kings of Israel were institutionalized during the course of development of the Davidic kingship. We hear no more about kings being seized by the spirit, but we have no doubt that they were anointed and given the spirit as an institutional right.

The close connection between Yahwe and his Messiah is negatively attested in Psalm 89:39ff., where Yahwe is said to have left his Messiah, permitted his defeat and his humiliation. Johnson interprets this Psalm as depicting ritual humiliation which "is not unlike that suffered by

---

[1] 1 Samuel 26:9. Cf. also 2 Samuel 1:14ff.; 4:9ff.

[2] 1 Kings 21:10,13; Exodus 22:27; 2 Samuel 19:22.

[3] 1 Samuel 10:10.

[4] 1 Samuel 16:13.

[5] Isaiah 32:15; Zechariah 12:10; Isaiah 44:3; Ezekiel 39:29; Joel 3:1ff.; cf. also Johnson, op. cit., p. 13.

Yahweh [illegible], [illegible] on [illegible] his hand upon [illegible] the [illegible] naming of a [illegible] heritage of Yahweh.

Another [illegible] that the older prophets [illegible] 11[illegible]. [illegible] We know that [illegible] of Yahweh is [illegible]. It seems that [illegible] practically [illegible] of [illegible] qualities [illegible] kings of Israel were [illegible] development of [illegible]. [illegible] about kings being [illegible] made that they were [illegible].

The close connection [illegible] consistently [illegible], [illegible] and to have left [illegible],

Another justification which [illegible]

[illegible]

1) [illegible]

the Babylonian king in the analogous New Years festival ... this dramatic deliverance from the kings (or nations) of the earth, this victory over "Death", is not achieved without an early disaster..."[1]

Ebed. Together with the ideology of the king and of founders of dynasties and cults, the Israelites adapted the ancient Canaanite title "servant".[2] The Ras Shamra tablets refer to KRT and Dan'el, who are both founders of cults and dynasties, as 'abd 'El. As this latter title suggests, "servant" is used in connection with a deity and signifies a relationship to a god. Lindhagen is probably right in suggesting that the title "servant" introduces us in the first place into the cultic functions of the king, especially into those functions connected with the New Years festival.[3] The ieros gamos, which is part of the rites of the New Years festival, establishes the role of the king as founder of dynasties.[4]

We may not have to go so far as to say that in the "servant" motif we find the influence of the Tammuz and Adonis rituals, because we do not know how strongly those rites were practiced among the Canaanites of Israel's time.

---

[1] Johnson, op. cit., p. 104; cf. Psalm 22:7ff.; 60:13ff.; 108:13f.; Isaiah 31:1ff., etc.

[2] Aage Bentzen, King and Messiah (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), pp. 46-47.

[3] Lindhagen, op. cit., p. 280.

[4] Ibid.

the [illegible] in the [illegible] Tammuz [illegible]
... this [illegible] self-surrender from the [illegible] (or nations)
of the earth, this [illegible], is not sanctioned
[illegible].

[illegible]. [illegible] to the [illegible] of [illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible], the [illegible] adopted the ancient [illegible], [illegible] "[illegible]" of the [illegible] tablets [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of cults and [illegible], as [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] this [illegible], "[illegible]" is [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] signifies a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] is certainly right in [illegible] that the [illegible] '[illegible]' [illegible] in the first place into the cultic [illegible] of the [illegible], especially into those functions connected with the New Year festival.[3] The [illegible], which is part of the rites of the New Years Festival, [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible] have to [illegible] [illegible] in the "[illegible]" [illegible] the influence of the [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] we do not [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] the [illegible] of Israel's [illegible].

---

[1] [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible]; [illegible], [illegible].

[2] [illegible], [illegible] ([illegible] Press, 19[illegible]), pp. [illegible].

[3] [illegible], op. cit., [illegible].

But we do have to say that the role of the king as servant is connected with the periodical changes in nature. In the New Year's festival the king becomes the slave and the slave becomes king. That the one who brings salvation necessarily has to suffer is one of the basic motifs of the fertility rites. We know that Baal achieved the climax of his power after he had been killed and resurrected. The king in the New Year's festival - as we shall see later - stands for the person of the god and "plays" the role of the deity.

The Israelite kings who are given the title "servant" are David, Solomon, and Hezekiah. The service of the Levites was called עבדה. The kings in the south, especially those named, understood themselves as the first servants of Yahwe.[1] The cultic service became concentrated on the king in Jerusalem instead of being in the country wherever the ark was located, and instead of being practiced by the Levites. Yahwe was no longer invisibly present with the armies of Israel; he was present in the person of the king, who took the role of a supreme mediator. It is not by accident that David was the main recipient of the title "servant" in the Old Testament. Sixty times David is called "servant" as the founder of a dynasty and of the cult in Jerusalem.[2] David is the ideal servant figure. As the servant of Yahwe

---

[1] A parallel would be the papal title *servus servorum dei*, which as a humble title is the highest title, in reality.

[2] 1 Samuel 23:10f.; 7:19ff.; 24:10; 25:39. Solomon referring to his father: 1 Kings 3:6; 8:24-26; Psalm 18:1; 36:1, etc.

But we do have to say more. The relation of the king as servant is connected with the mythical 'dragon' in which, in the New Year's Festival the king becomes the slain and the slave becomes king. What the one and the other substitute respectively has to suffer is one of the basic motifs of the [illegible] rites. We know that real substitution [illegible] of the [illegible] after he had been killed and [illegible]. The [illegible] New Year's Festival - as we shall see below - [illegible] person of the [illegible] 'dragon' but [illegible] of the [illegible].

The [illegible] who [illegible] the title 'servant' are David, Solomon, and [illegible]. The [illegible] of the [illegible] was [illegible]. The [illegible] in the early [illegible] those named, understood themselves as the first servants of Yahweh.[1] The cultic service became concentrated in the king in Jerusalem instead of being [illegible] wherever the ark was located, and instead of [illegible] the Levites. There was no longer [illegible] with the service of Yahweh; he was present in the person of the king, who took the role of a [illegible] minister. It is not by accident that David was the main recipient of the title 'servant' in the Old Testament. [illegible] David is called "servant" as the founder of a dynasty and of the cult in Jerusalem. David is the first servant [illegible].

---

[1] [illegible] would be the [illegible] did, which [illegible]

[2] [illegible] 23:10f.; [illegible] servant, to his [illegible] [illegible] 18:1; 20:1, etc.

he saved Israel from her enemies.[1] He was a just man who kept the commandments of the Lord and was faithful and righteous.[2] Solomon and Hezekiah are mentioned a few times as servants of Yahwe.[3]

Righteous. The righteousness of the king is essential for the existence of the whole people. When David sinned against the Lord, an epidemic came and slew the population.[4] The actions of the king fall back on the people, for the king stands for the people. Johnson says that pestilence and drought are to be attributed to the fact that the king violated the sanctions of the group,[5] but this is not quite true. The tradition in 2 Samuel 24 clearly indicates that the relationship between Yahwe and David was violated and that the people participated only in a secondary way. David decides what kind of plague shall come.

The same dependency of the people upon the king is found on the positive side: if the nation is to prosper, the king must act according to the law of Yahwe and must be a symbol of righteousness. The shalom of the nation depends on the righteousness of its king. The king proves himself righteous when he is victorious and defeats the enemies of

---

[1] 2 Samuel 3:18.

[2] 1 Kings 3:6; 11:38.

[3] 1 Kings 3:6ff.; 8:23ff.; 2 Chronicles 32:16b.

[4] 2 Samuel 24.

[5] Johnson, op. cit., p. 3.

[illegible] Tamar from her husband.[1] He was a just one who [illegible] the commandments of the Lord and was faithful and righteous.[2] Chosen and blessed [illegible] a few times as a consequence of virtue.[3]

Stability. The righteousness of the king is essential for the existence of the world [illegible]. [illegible] against the Torah, an epidemic [illegible]. The actions of the king [illegible] the people. [illegible] the king atones for the people. [illegible] and [illegible] to be [illegible] violated the [illegible] of the people, [illegible] true. The tradition [illegible] the relationship between [illegible] and [illegible] the people [illegible] only in a [illegible] way. [illegible] what kind of [illegible] shall come.

The [illegible] of the [illegible] upon the [illegible] found on the positive side: if the nation is prosperous, [illegible] king must act accordingly to [illegible] and [illegible] a symbol of righteousness. The [illegible] of the [illegible] on the righteousness of its ruler. The [illegible] power [illegible] righteous when he is victorious [illegible] the [illegible] of his people. A victorious campaign therefore is always justification. The king proved himself zadik because Yahwe was on his side during the battle. We may say that in the person of the righteous king Yahwe was leading the people. An unrighteous king would not however represent Yahwe.[1] This righteousness in a forensic sense belongs also to the salvatory sense of righteousness of the king.

---

[1] [illegible] Samuel [illegible].

[2] [illegible] Kings [illegible]; I [illegible].

[4] [illegible] Samuel 21.

[5] Johnson, op. cit., [illegible].

The close relationship between king and Yahwe is apparent in the formulations of oath and curse which belong in Israel to the realm of law. Yahwe and the king are both called upon in these phrases.[2] Furthermore, the punishment for blasphemy and insulting the king are the same, because in the king Yahwe is present and therefore insulted also.[3] The Israelites turned to their king for judicial decisions.[4] The will of the king must be the intent of the law. Solomon was famous for his "wise decisions".[5]

In Psalm 82 the social welfare side of righteousness is combined with the righteousness of Yahwe, who judges the gods and proves himself Lord of the earth. It is Israel, his people. A victorious campaign therefore is always justification. The king proved himself *right* because Yahwe was on his side during the battle. We may say that in the person of the righteous king Yahwe was leading the people. An unrighteous king would not however represent Yahwe.[1] This righteousness in a forensic sense belongs also to the salvatory sense of righteousness of the king.

---

[1] The importance of the righteousness of the king is attested also in extra-biblical texts. Johnson, op. cit., p. 5, has assembled the evidence for the righteousness of the king in Ras Shamra and Byblos.

[2] 1 Samuel 12:5-17:55; 20:3; 25:26; 2 Samuel 11:11; 14:19; 2 Kings 2:2ff.; 4:30; Isaiah 8:21.

[3] 1 Kings 21:10ff.; Exodus 22:27; Leviticus 24:16. Cf. also Gressmann, op. cit., p. 28.

[4] 2 Samuel 15:1-6.

[5] 1 Kings 3:17ff.; 4:29ff.

The close relationship between king and Yahwe is apparent in the formulations of oath and curse which belong in Israel to the realm of law. Yahwe and the king are both called upon in these phrases.[2] Furthermore, the punishment for blasphemy and insulting the king are the same, because in the king Yahwe is present and therefore insulted also.[3] The Israelites turned to their king for judicial decisions.[4] The will of the king must be the intent of the law. Solomon was famous for his "wise decisions".[5]

In Psalm 82 the general welfare side of righteousness is combined with the righteousness of Yahwe, the judge who goes and proves himself Lord of the earth. It is Israel, of course, which profits from the destruction of Yahwe's enemies, for Yahwe's enemies are Israel's enemies.[1] The universal judgment will serve to help Israel to its place close to the "sun",[2] or in other words to prove Israel's righteousness and the wickedness of the nations. The Sitz im Leben of these ideas is the throne ascension festival. Yahwe as the Lord of Israel ascends to the throne represented in the person of the king. The throne ascension theology does not know the idea of Yahwe's judgment of Israel; it is also inconceivable that Yahwe could ever repudiate his covenant with the house of David.

---

[1] This importance of the righteousness of the king is attested also in extra-biblical texts. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 5, has assembled the evidence for the righteousness of the king in Ras Shamra and Byblos.

[2] I Samuel [illegible]

[3] I Kings 21:10ff.; Exodus 22:27; Leviticus 24:16. Cf. also Gressmann, *op. cit.*, p. [illegible].

[4] [illegible]

[5] I Kings 3:17ff.; [illegible].

Chosen. The king is the chosen one of Yahwe. This is especially true of Saul and David.[3] The king is the life breath of his people; in his shadow they live among the nations.[4] Because Yahwe had chosen the king in Jerusalem, he guarantees his presence, and that means his help and his protection, for this king. The election of the king constitutes the shalom of the people. Not only David is chosen, but his whole dynasty,[5] and thus the continuation of shalom is guaranteed. For the sake of his people Israel, Yahwe of course, which usually [illegible] of Yahweh's anointing, [illegible] generally.¹ The universal [illegible] to its place [illegible] to the "[illegible]",² [illegible] Israel's misfortunes and the [illegible]. The [illegible] in Judges [illegible] Yahwe as the [illegible] of [illegible] in the person of the king. [illegible] does not know the [illegible]; it is also inconceivable that [illegible] the [illegible].

---

[1] Psalm 97:7.

[2] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 74.

[3] Deuteronomy 17:15; 18:5; 1 Samuel 10:24; 2 Samuel 6:21; 1 Kings 8:16; 11:34; Psalm 78:70.

[4] Lamentations 4:20; Psalm 104:29ff.

[5] 2 Samuel 6-7.

Chosen. The king is the [illegible] of Yahwe. This is especially true of Saul and David. [illegible] in [illegible] chosen they [illegible].⁴ [illegible] he [illegible] the [illegible] motivation for his kingship. The [illegible] of the [illegible] attributes the choice of the people, [illegible] only [illegible] chosen [illegible] that [illegible],⁵ [illegible] to be [illegible]. [illegible]

---

¹[illegible] 9:7.

²[illegible], [illegible], p. [illegible].

³Deuteronomy 17:15; [illegible]; 1 Samuel 10:24; 2 Samuel 6:21; 1 Kings 8:16; 11:34; Psalm 78:70.

⁴[illegible] 4:20; [illegible].

⁵2 Samuel 6-7.

instituted the monarchy.[1] The people of the king are the people of Yahwe.[2] The term for the election of the king is בחר.[3] The *bachar* theology replaced covenant theology in Jerusalem. In Jerusalem the king was chosen, not the people. *Bachar* is a term of salvation, one should say of sure salvation, as against the covenant, which denotes a relationship based upon mutual responsibilities. We never get the feeling that the responsibilities in the *bachar* are emphasized. Certainly the people were not directly participating. David had an everlasting covenant with Yahwe. Failure to fulfill the covenantal *torah*, which must receive punishment, would nevertheless not annul the covenant.[4] The supreme position of the king as the chosen one of Yahwe is even more established.

Son. As the son of Yahwe the king is possibly depicted in Psalm 110. The text is not quite clear, but we may suggest that the Psalm spoke about the birth of the king out of the "womb of the dawn".[5] This picture certainly is not original to the author of Psalm 110. In Isaiah 14:12f. we have an ironical song on the Babylonian king, whose fall

---

[1] 2 Samuel 5:12.

[2] Psalm 28:8; 72:2.

[3] בחר is used in reference to Saul: 1 Samuel 10:24 etc.; David: 1 Samuel 16:8ff.; Absalom: 2 Samuel 16:18; Solomon: 1 Chronicles 28:5f.

[4] Johnson, *op*. *cit*., p. 22.

[5] Psalm 110:3b.

from heaven like a star applies the mythological motif of Helal ben Sachar, the morning star, who tried to establish his throne upon the mountain in the far north.[1] In Psalm 110 the reigning king was considered the son of the dawn. That means he is the morning star.[2] Gressmann suggests that the morning star and the dawn are Amorite deities.[3] If this be true we would have another Amorite element in Psalm 110 in addition to Melchizedek. Perhaps already the Jerusalemite Amorites, the Jebusites, considered their ancient king, Melchizedek, a son of the dawn.[4]

Psalm 110:3 and 2:7 clearly reflect the opinion that the king was not naturally the son of God, but that through adoption he became the son of God. The adoption formula appears also in 2 Samuel 7:14, where it found a place in the prophecy of Nathan. Through adoption the Jerusalemite king very nearly approached the divine sphere. Here we find possibly the influence of God-king ideology.[5] Perhaps we may even conclude that the idea of the king being God was known in pre-Israelitic Jerusalem. This would explain the sayings about the Jerusalem king which differ so from heaven like a star [illegible]

---

[1] Isaiah 14:13 and Gressmann, op. cit., p. 36.

[2] Gressmann, op. cit.; for the different meanings of this title see Numbers 24:17, where this star has not the negative connotation as in Isaiah 14.

[3] Ibid., p. 38.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Noth, ZTK, 1950, p. 185.

Helel ben Shachar, the [illegible] tried to establish his throne upon the [illegible].[1] In Psal. 110 the morning [illegible] the dew, therefore he is the [illegible] star.[2] [illegible] suggests both the morning star and the [illegible] deities.[3] If this be true we [illegible] Psalm 110 in addition to [illegible] [illegible] ancient [illegible]

[illegible]

that the king was not [illegible] through adoption he became the son of God. The [illegible] formula appears also in 2 Samuel [illegible] place in the prophecy of Nathan. [illegible]

[illegible]

been [illegible] possibly the influence of [illegible] Further we can even conclude that the [illegible] king [illegible] known in pre-Israelitic [illegible] words [illegible] decisively from the characteristics of the kingships of Judah and Israel.

---

[1] [illegible]

[2] [illegible]

[3] [illegible]

Part of the ritual of the adoption of the king is that Yahwe gives a name to the king,[1] and grants him a prayer.[2] The king is installed with scepter[3] and crown.[4] The adoption ritual reflects the customs of other nations.[5] The ritual became part of the crowning ceremonies. Every new king became the son of Yahwe, lifting him out of the common sphere as a person and making him almost divine.

In our discussion of the other titles and roles we have seen how this closeness to Yahwe elevated the Jerusalem king and made him the guarantor of salvation for his nation. This absolute position was not without criticism. Isaiah talks about the office with which the Davidic king is entrusted by Yahwe and accordingly the king is only an official.[6] The true king is Yahwe.[7] The official royal cult theology, however, supported the nearly divine position of the king. And even the prophetic messianic expectation

---

[1] 2 Samuel 7:9; 1 Kings 1:47; Isaiah 9:5.

[2] 1 Kings 3:5ff.; Psalm 2:8; 20:5; 21:3,5.

[3] Isaiah 9:5; Psalm 110:2.

[4] Psalm 21:4; 2 Kings 11:12.

[5] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 133, suggests the influence of Egyptian rituals.

[6] Isaiah 9:5.

[7] Isaiah 6:5.

is closely connected with the dynasty of David.[1] From Mahabharata to Vergil the messianic expectation is the expectation of the birth of the savior child.[2] Again it is Isaiah who converted the idea of the divine savior into the adoption of the Davidic son of God ascending to the throne. The prince of peace was clearly subordinated to Yahwe.[3]

God. The only time in the Old Testament where the king is clearly called god is in Psalm 45:6. "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever !" It may be that this singular evidence is due to the deuteronomistic redaction and later redactions which tried to eliminate passages like this. Possibly in popular Yahwism or in the theology of the royal priests the idea of the divine kingship was more common than our traditions reflect. The only thing we can do is to point out the closeness of the Jerusalem king to Yahwe as we have done in the previous sections. This closeness does not mean, however, that the king in Jerusalem is a god.

The king is crowned with a golden crown.[4] He receives eternal life from Yahwe,[5] a possession which only gods own. The king in Jerusalem becomes a king universal; he

---

[1] Isaiah 11:1ff.; Micah 5:1.

[2] Hempel, ZAW, LXV (1953), p. 137.

[3] Isaiah 9:5f.; Hempel, ZAW, LXV (1953), p. 137; Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 133.

[4] Psalm 21:4.

[5] Ibid.

[illegible]

[illegible]

shall inherit the nations.[1] Yahwe protects the king in battle.[2] We find the picture familiar to us from Egyptian and Assyrian reliefs, where the god educates the king in archery.[3] The king is the owner of superhuman wisdom[4] and superhuman braveness.[5]

The conclusion is that there is no ground on which we could maintain a divine kingship in Israel. We have to reckon, however, with a close relationship between Yahwe and king which frequently comes close to making the king divine.

---

[1] Psalm 2:8.

[2] Psalm 110:5.

[3] Psalm 21:13; 45:6; 18:35.

[4] 2 Samuel 14:17,20; 1 Kings 3:28.

[5] 1 Samuel 29:9.

The Covenant Between Yahwe and David

The historical texts concerning the rise of David clearly depict the decisive political phases which finally led to the enthronement of David as king over all Israel. The tradition does not offer an ideal picture. David is depicted in all realism, with all his faults and ambitions. The chronistic work of history later did not dare to include the dark background of the mercenary David into its idealizing report about the house of David which was chosen by Yahwe.

The youngest line of tradition recounts events in David's early youth, preceding his election and anointing.[1] The story probably tries to satisfy the demand for a prophetic designation of David according to the fashion of the charismatic kings. Historically, this tradition does not report the true order of events. Von Rad is certainly right to date the election in the Nathan prophecy during the time of the established kingship of David, the time "when the king dwelt in his house".[2] Yahwe refuses David's offer to build him a house.[3] The theological point of this refusal is closely connected with the promise of Nathan; David shall

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 307. 1 Samuel 16:1ff.

[2] 2 Samuel 7:1. Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 308.

[3] 2 Samuel 7.

not build a house for Yahwe, but Yahwe will build a house for David.[1] This house and the kingdom of David shall last forever and ever.[2]

The everlasting covenant of 2 Samuel 23:1ff. concurs with the prophecy of Nathan. It is not enough to say that through this everlasting covenant the relationship between Yahwe and David is put on a new legal basis.[3] This covenant has no legal basis or foundation, but is based on the mercy and love of the superior partner, Yahwe. Yahwe swore to David "an inviolable oath from which he will not swerve."[4]

> "Here in the face of historical-human situations of the establishment of a monarchy the almost terrifying promise of everlasting continuity is made... The kingship still is not divine and the king not a true god, but the promise of everlasting continuity has lifted this institution out of the changing mood of human history and elevated it into the divine sphere."[5]

As we have pointed out in our discussion of the title "the chosen one of Yahwe", the term used in Hebrew for the election of the house of David is בחר. This term is not new.[6] Together with the rise of the kingship, however, a new usage of the term בחר appears.[7] This

---

[1] 1 Samuel 7:11.

[2] 2 Samuel 7:16.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 307.

[4] Psalm 132:11.

[5] Noth, ZTK, 1950, p. 187 (my translation). Cf. also Ernst Jenni, "Das Wort 'olam im Alten Testament," ZAW, LXV (1953), p. 10.

[6] Koch, ZAW, LXVII (1955), pp. 222ff.

[7] 1 Samuel 10:24; 16:8-10; 2 Samuel 6:21; 16:18.

usage of bachar could have been influenced by the Jerusalem ideology[1] because it has no foundation or background in Israel. This Jerusalem tradition never became a tradition throughout Israel, for we never hear about an Israelite king as being chosen by Yahwe.

The once-and-forever election of the house of David still has some features of the charismatic kingship. The designation through Yahwe and the acclamation through the people are still present to a certain degree.[2] The royal charisma, however, had become an institution. It is no longer limited to the person whom Yahwe had gifted with it. Now the whole house of David owns the charisma as an everlasting possession; the spontaneous gift of Yahwe was made heritable.

The election of the house of David and of Mount Zion are connected.[3] What is left from the covenant which we know as the relationship between Yahwe and Israel? Yahwe had become equal to Baal with a house on a mountain. He was closely related to the royal house, and it was his function to protect and preserve it. Through the king Yahwe was connected with the people, at least officially. Yahwe's obligations were the welfare and the protection of Jerusalem

---

[1] Koch, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 224.

[2] Alt, Kleine Schriften, p. 132.

[3] For this combination see 2 Samuel 23, "the last words of David".

and Judah. Would he not protect his own house? Official Yahwism was now a cult of security and fertility. Yahwe was limited to the cult; he was caught in a golden cage. He became a god who guaranteed the periodical coming and going of the seasons, the annual renewal of the covenant, and the strength of the king for the good of his people.

The King is the Corporate Whole

According to Israelite understanding of life, each relationship is based upon a covenant. Yahwe is Lord of the covenant and is a member of it. A covenant is dependent upon the fulfillment of the obligations or responsibilities which are the essence of the covenant. Mowinckel certainly is wrong when he says that Yahwe granted a covenant to Israel in spite of the sin of the people.[1] Sin can only be the result of a covenant, but not already a condition under which it is established.

As we explained in our section on the covenant, the relationship between Yahwe and Israel is not determined or even regulated by the cult. Israel's religion very basically is not a cult religion in the sense that the surrounding religions were cult religions. The functions of the Levitical priesthood are primarily non-cultic. After the exile when no monarchy existed in Israel, it was no accident that the cult was neglected and the covenantal torah became the basis of all worship.

Cult in Israel was the influence of the Canaanite practices and especially the royal cult in Jerusalem; these were foreign to Israelite basic beliefs. This is manifest in the different character of the two covenants: one formed

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 152.

the basis of amphictyonic Israel, and the other Yahwe made with the house of David. The latter was a cultic reality. It was renewed in and through the cult, and was the means of salvation. Accordingly, the covenantal corporate solidarity was the result of the covenant between Yahwe and Israel; it was different from the cultic corporate solidarity which was established through the relationship between Yahwe and the king in Jerusalem.

According to old oriental thinking, the king was the embodiment of the people. King and people are one, but the king comes first in the sense that he represented the people and not vice versa.[1] What Yahwe assured the king he also assured to the people.[2] The victory of the king was the victory of the people, etc. Each enthronement was understood as the divine assurance of a new era, of new natural conditions.[3] King and fertility belonged together; the king was the bringer of fertility among Israel's neighbors and also according to the Jerusalem royal ideology.[4]

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 299.

[2] Psalm 132.

[3] Psalm 72:16; cf. also von Rad, Theologie..., p. 318.

[4] Gyllenberg, op. cit., p. 116. Here Kapelrud states that the deities of the ancient Near East were all givers of fertility. The kings were their sons and chosen by them as their representatives. They were gifted with the power of giving fertility by their Lords (cf. Psalm 16? 72:15). Another evidence might be 2 Samuel 21. The famine which rests on the land is due to the sin of Saul. The result of the famine was poor crops. Had Yahwe withdrawn

In the king the "I" of the people was incarnate in a mystical way.[1] As the incarnation or representative of his people, the king acted in the cult for the benefit of his people. Through the cult the king preserved the shalom, the harmony, of Gross-Ich.[2] Because of the "covenant" between Yahwe and king, the blessing which rested upon the king was communicated to the people in the person of the king. In the cult this blessing was experienced as strength for soul and body. The cult also attempted to find some regularity in the acting of Yahwe, if not to create this regularity. The king was the receiver of the regulated mercy of Yahwe. Through him Yahwe was made useful to the purposes of the people.

The annual periodical renewal of all natural life was one thing which needed divine aid. The deities in the Near East frequently were fighters against chaos. Their power rested upon their overcoming this chaos. Defeat of chaos was the work of deities and meant the continuation of seasonal order which was so vital to human life.

To preserve this order and to prevent the unforeseen (even if it was Yahwe) was the supreme purpose of the cult.

---

his favor from David? David had to find some device to prove that he had not lost the power of promoting fertility. (That he got rid of the house of Saul by surrendering almost all of Saul's sons to the Gibeonites may reflect a case of political murder. Our tradition conceals the historical reasons behind 2 Samuel 21.)

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 300.

[2] Ibid., p. 150.

The king as the representative of his god was the guarantor of the natural order and of its undisturbed continuation. If there was any disturbance such as a prolonged drought or a plague, the king may have violated the shalom of the Gross-Ich.[1] On the other hand, the king's sedekah guaranteed that the nation would prosper. The king was the embodiment of righteousness. He was the only place where people and Yahwe met. He was the channel through which divine blessing flowed to the people.[2] Divine blessing included everything, not only the spiritual but also the material. This blessing was essential for life, health, and fertility. The righteous man was the blessed man. The righteous king was a blessing to his people.

As we have remarked, the essential goal was continuation of life or in our particular case, continuation of the kingship as the guarantor of life. The finiteness of life was of course apparent to ancient man. He sought to overcome this, and the person of the king was one means. His ancestry was traced back to primordial kings.[3] An everlasting covenant assured the present king of everlasting succession. Every king was a David in the sense that every successor of David partook in the everlasting covenant

---

[1] Besides 2 Samuel 21, see 2 Samuel 24:10-25; 3:28f.; 14:9; Jeremiah 15:4; Genesis 12:17; 20:3f.; 1 Kings 18:18; (cf. also Johnson, op. cit., p. 3.).

[2] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 301.

[3] Bentzen, King and Messiah, pp. 41-2.

between Yahwe and David. The continuity of the house of David constituted the continuity of the people.[1]

---

[1] The classical land of these ideas is Egypt (cf. Noth, ZTK, 1950, p. 168). In thousands of years of history this country hardly changed its character. It lived in seclusion from other nations and absorbed foreign elements which penetrated into it. Here the Pharaoh truly was god incarnate. At the same time he was the supreme priest, sun and life of his people. In the age-old cultures in Mesopotamia the same idea may have been known, although in biblical times we have no reason to say that the rulers of Babylon and Assyria considered themselves gods. They had a close relationship to their deities just as the king of Jerusalem had to Yahwe. It is our opinion that the sacral kingship of the Jerusalem king is dependent upon the Canaanite and Mesopotamian example rather than upon Egypt, where the king's position was quite different. To be an incarnation, a son, or a servant of god is different from actually being god as the Pharaoh in Egypt was. Cf. Bentzen, King and Messiah, p. 19.

The New Year's and Enthronement Festival

In our discussion of the Passover feast we emphasized that the Passover did not have the same significance for the southern kingdom that it had for the northern kingdom. In the south the Passover was overshadowed by the autumn/New Year's festival.[1] There have been a number of attempts made to enlighten the background and significance of the New Year's festival in Jerusalem.[2]

The New Year's festival was introduced with the blowing of horns on the first of Tishri.[3] This date concurred with the New Year's festival in Babylon. In Jerusalem and in Babylon the New Year's festival was the throne ascension of god and king.[4]

---

[1] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 338.

[2] See Bentzen, King and Messiah, pp. 24ff.; Johnson, op. cit., pp. 50ff.; Widengren, op. cit., pp. 48ff.; Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, pp. 81ff.; von Rad, Theologie..., pp. 49ff.; Kraus, op. cit., pp. 27ff.; Theodor H. Gaster, Thespis (New York: Henry Schumann, 1950), pp. 74ff.

[3] Psalm 98:6; 47:$\overset{5}{6}$; 81:$\overset{3}{4}$; cf. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 81.

[4] A king in Babylon or Assur did not follow his predecessor to the throne de jure until the New Year's day following the death of the predecessor (cf. Bentzen, King and Messiah, p. 16 and E.R. Thiele, The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), pp. 29ff.). Thiele uses the ancient records of the Assyrians to establish the chronology of the kings in Israel and Judah. Two possibilities of counting the regnal years of the kings are from Tishri to Tishri or from Nisan to Nisan. There is evidence that Solomon employed the Tishri to Tishri year. Work on the temple began in the second

Kraus maintains that in the Old Testament there is not sufficient evidence for the existence of a Jerusalemite throne ascension festival. The theme "Yahwe is king" does not mention the Davidic dynasty, therefore we may talk about the throne ascension of Yahwe but not of the king.[1] Considering the preceding sections on the close relationship between Yahwe and his earthly representative, we should not distinguish between the throne ascension of the king and of Yahwe. The cultic celebration

---

month of the fourth year of Solomon (1 Kings 6:1,37). The temple was completed in the eighth month of Solomon's eleventh year after seven years of building (1 Kings 6:38). If we should count a Nisan to Nisan year for Solomon as the tradition does (Exodus 12:2; Leviticus 23:5,24,27; Numbers 9:1,5,11; 28:16; 1 Kings 8:2; 2 Kings 25:25; Jeremiah 41:1,8), the temple would have been built in eight years instead of seven. Thiele calls the Babylonian-Assyrian way where a successor succeeds the throne at the New Years Day following his predecessor's death the accession year method. When the reign of a king is counted from the moment of death of the last king, it is called a non-accession year. The non-accession year was employed in the northern kingdom. Both kingdoms, however, were not consistent. Under strong northern influence (2 Kings 8:18) Judah adjusted her reckoning of regnal years to that of Israel. This includes all southern kings from Jehoram to Joash. Under Amaziah the shift back to the accession year system was made. Soon even Israel adopted the accession year system, due to the great influence of Assyria in the west. A non-accession year in Israel may point to a different emphasis upon the importance of the New Years festival. In Israel it seems we do not have an equivalent for the Jerusalem New Year with its particular cultic implications.

[1] Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 49. Kraus is quite inconsistent in his thesis. He tries to devaluate the argument of an annual enthronement through maintaining the absence of records for a repetition of the procession of the ark up to Mount Zion, 2 Samuel 6-7. On the other hand, he says that the same tradition is the *hieros logos* of the Jerusalem sanctuary. What else is the significance of a *hieros logos* but that it establishes a cultic pattern which is followed through the ages?

demanded the king to "play the role" of Yahwe.

The New Year's festival was possibly adopted from Mesopotamia via Canaanite rituals. The original festival was filled with Israelite content. The procession of the ark to Mount Zion occupied an important part in the New Years festival.[1] The rabbinic tradition preserved history: the "scripture lessons" for the New Year's festival are shofaroth, about the blowing of trumpets; malkijoth, about the kingship of Yahwe; and zicharoth, about the new creation. The second part, concerning the enthronement of Yahwe, is the most complicated of the three. This part includes also the enthronement of the king. In fact, assuming the king "plays the role" of Yahwe in the cultic ritual of the throne ascension, the ascension of the king and Yahwe were the same event.[2] Yahwe became king and ascended to his throne.[3] Yahwe of course was not anointed and did not need the help

---

[1] 1 Kings 8:2. The date is the month etanim, according to a gloss the month tishri. 2 Samuel 6 does not offer any date, but we have to assume the same date as in 1 Kings 8 which is a repetition of 2 Samuel 6 (cf. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 81.).

[2] See Psalm 2 and 110:1-7; the king is enthroned at the right hand of the Lord. The sanctuary is the throne of holiness (Jeremiah 17:12). Yahwe sits on his holy throne (Psalm 47:9). In the temple of Jerusalem stands Yahwe's throne (Isaiah 6:1-2). The king on the throne is seated at the right of God on the mountain in the north (Psalm 80:18). The throne is equated with the dynasty; it has something of an everlasting quality (Psalm 45:7; 61:8; 89:37; 2 Samuel 7:16; Psalm 89:5). Cf. Widengren, op. cit., p. 45.

[3] Psalm 99; 100; 95:3; 98:6.

of priests; he was clothed with majesty and girdled with strength.[1] Accordingly, the earthly king was clothed with precious vestments and was called the son of God. Through adoption the king probably received a throne name.[2]

In the Babylonian New Year's festival the king is described as penitent; his royal insignia are taken away and he is mistreated.[3] This does not mean that the king dies. Even the "wake up" in Psalm 35:23, 44:24, and 59:5 are not to be understood as proclaiming the resurrection of the king or god. There is no trace of a dying and rising god in Israelite religion. The penitent king is close to the land of the dead and fulfills a role in the cult which demands the utmost humiliation from him. For the ancient mind the events in the cult were real, they were not "played". Keeping this in mind we understand the frequent "actuality" in the language, which sounds as if it were depicting an actual occurence.

That death and resurrection were "played" by the king instead of god in the New Year's ritual is attested in

---

[1] Psalm 93:1.

[2] Cf. von Rad, Theologie..., p. 49. Here von Rad points out the parallel to old Egyptian ceremonial texts. The so-called protocol of the king containing the throne name of the king, his divine sonship, transfer of the government, and the promise of everlasting continuity of the king's reign were handed over to the king by the deity at the occasion of his enthronement. (See the עדות which the high priest Jehoiada hands to the young king Joash: 2 Kings 11:12). The king received a throne name. The word עדות reminds of the covenant. Sometimes עדות is used synonymously for ברית, and this word עדות really is used in the "last words of David", 2 Samuel 23:5. Cf. Ps.132:12.

[3] Bentzen, King and Messiah, p. 26.

Hosea 6:1-3: "He will revive us in two or three days; he will raise us up that we may live before him..." It seems then that on the third day the resurrection of God was celebrated; his resurrection, according to Canaanite analogies, surely represented the resurrection of all natural life together with the life and fortune of the whole people.[1] Resurrection marked the victory of the Lord and his anointed over their antagonists. Here two motifs are interwoven. The enemies of Yahwe sometimes are historic enemies of his people (like the Egyptians),[2] and sometimes the enemies of Yahwe are the powers of chaos.[3] Here we change into the creation aspect of the enthronement. The coming of Yahwe as king meant new creation, a new beginning; the power of disorder and chaos, Tiamat, is defeated.[4]

---

[1] For the Canaanite analogies see Psalm 7:7-8, where Yahwe is surrounded by the "assembly of the peoples" returning to his home on the heights. Both motifs are known from Ugarit: El surrounded by his court, and Baal returning to Zaphon. Linguistically, Hebrew מרום corresponds to Ugaritic מרים. See also שוב with תב for Baal returning to his mountain home. עלה is used for Yahwe ascending to the throne, and see עלי for Baal ascending to his mountain throne. Cf. Widengren, op. cit., p. 67.

[2] Psalm 76:1. Cf. also Isaiah 30:7; Psalm 114:2; Deuteronomy 33:4.

[3] Psalm 46. For the combination of these two events, see Psalm 66:5-7.

[4] Cf. the Babylonian myth. Tiamat, chaos, rebels against the high gods Anu and Ea. They try to fight Tiamat but are not strong enough to overcome it. Therefore they go to Marduk, the youngest son of Ea and ask him to take up the fight. Marduk accepts the challenge under the condition that they will make him king after he defeats Tiamat. Marduk defeats Tiamat and becomes king. Out of chaos Marduk creates

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The first part of what we considered rabbinic tradition surrounding the New Year's festival were the shofaroth. The blowing of trumpets,[1] the clapping of hands,[2] and great joy in all cities of the country and among all of Yahwe's people,[3] are due to the establishment of Yahwe on Zion, where he is seated on cherubim.[4] Yahwe rules over the earth as universal king.[5] Yahwe is represented among his people through his son, the anointed, chosen, servant, and righteous one.

It is our thesis that the origin of eschatology lies in the New Year's festival. The tradition of Hosea 6:1-3 very possibly reflects the true attitude of the people. They trusted the cult to provide them with satisfaction and salvation. They knew from the cult rituals

---

cosmos. (Cf. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 41.) This seems to be the pattern of the Jerusalem New Years festival. The power of chaos is historized. Egypt is Rahab and the exodus is the new creation. The historization, however, is not so perfect that the underlying myth does not shine through. The Babylonian Tiamat is tehom in Hebrew. In Genesis 2:6 (cf. 1:2), tehom covers the earth. The removal of tehom means creation. Psalm 93:1-4, which is filled with Ugaritic terminology (cf. Widengren, op. cit., p. 63), depicts the victory of Yahwe over the "waters".

[1] Psalm 47:6; 81:4.

[2] Psalm 47:2.

[3] 1 Kings 1:40.

[4] Exodus 25:18ff.; 1 Samuel 4:4; 2 Samuel 6:2, etc.

[5] Psalm 29:7-10; 24.

of the New Year's festival that the "death" of the king and of Yahwe was not the last word. After three days they knew that life would return. The cult provided hope because everything must happen according to the ritual. We know also that the ancient mind experienced in a real way the events celebrated by the cult. Worshippers participated in the death and resurrection. They put their faith in events in the ritual. For them, those events were essential for daily life as well as for national ambitions. When their king died their hope died. When the king was resurrected they were resurrected, because their king's and god's life was their own life, and without them there was no way to exist. The eschaton then is the third day, the day upon which the hope of the people rested, and this hope is never disappointed.[1]

---

[1] Consider the events during and after the death of Christ. He was killed. Everything was over, the disciples were dispersed and desperate. On the third day Christ was resurrected. New hope, new life came with his resurrection. We are Christ's disciples. When we celebrate these events truly, we participate in the hopelessness of Friday and Saturday. We rejoice on Easter Sunday. The events are as real for us as anything can be real. How much more so was it for the ancient people, who lived much more than we do in cultic realities. Of course there is another parallel. The Easter cult of the Church loses its original meaning when it provides security because everyone "knows" that Christ will not remain with the dead. The same thing happened to the cult in Israel. The prophets attacked faith in salvation per se. Automatic salvation is not salvation. Yahwe wanted zedekah and faithfulness. He did not want sacrifices and the perfect celebration of rituals. He wanted obedience.

The Kingship of Yahwe and the Kingship in Jerusalem

The idea of Yahwe as king of Israel cannot be older in Israel than the kingship itself. It is probable that other people understood their gods as kings before Israel did. Israel may have inherited the idea of the kingship of Yahwe together with the institution of the monarchy. The word melech in nomadic languages does not mean king, but leader. Yahwe was considered the leader of the Israelites in holy wars, on their exodus from Egypt for example. Thus it was easy to adopt the royal title for Yahwe since he already had fulfilled royal responsibilities in leading the people. This change in meaning of the term melech became even more useful when the Israelites settled in Canaan and gave up their nomadic way of life. The nomadic leader was substituted by the king.

As we have seen, changes in human forms of leadership were influenced by changes in the way of living; in turn, changes in human forms of leadership influenced the understanding of Yahwe. The cult in Jerusalem was the main promoter of this development. In the New Year's and throne ascension festival Yahwe adopted the king as his son. The king was invested with royal rights and unique - almost divine - qualities were bestowed upon him. In the yearly ascension to the throne as a cultic festival, the relationship

between Yahwe and king was renewed. In the person of his human servant, Yahwe himself was proclaimed king. The anointed was Yahwe in Israel in the sense that the king, as the anointed, represented Yahwe among his people. The continuity of the monarchy assured the continuity of the relationship between Israel and Yahwe. Upon the king the welfare of the whole people was dependent. Therefore the promise that the house of David would be everlasting was not only "salvation" for the Davidic monarchy but also for those who were governed by it.

The king in his person took judgment upon himself; Psalm 89:42ff., which reflects one stage in the cultic festival of the New Year, depicts the king as being utterly humiliated. Psalms 30 and 88 are prayers of the king. He has been delivered from Sheol and Yahwe has revived him from the Pit. Although we do not assume that the king met physical death in the New Year's festival, Sheol and the Pit had been realities for the worshippers in Jerusalem; deliverance of the king was celebrated by the people as the sign of sustenance of their own life and as a sign for the assistance of Yahwe.

Thus the end became in reality a new beginning, a new possibility for king and people. Here lies the origin of the messianic hope. It is true that different kings fulfilled the hope of their people in different ways. Some of them came closer to the messianic ideal than others.

The ideal was David, who was the messianic king. Basically all kings had the same gifts and position; they all were anointed. It was the realization of promises and hope which served to prove them. David had been most successful, meaning the most blessed. He was an ideal king in the same sense that Augustus was an ideal king.

Gressmann says that the idea of the final end as connected with faith in the Messiah can only be explained through concepts of a mythological nature.[1] An ideal kingship of the end of time is best explained by an ideal kingship in the beginning of time. Since we do not have anything like an ancient ideal king in the early kingship of Israel and Judah, Gressmann concludes that the messianic hope must have been inherited from the Amorites. According to Psalm 110, Melchizedek was the ancient father of the Jerusalem dynasty and therefore possibly also the ancient ideal king and Messiah.[2]

We shall try to give another explanation of the phenomenon of the Messiah in Israel. Originally the title Messiah or anointed did not have any eschatological connotation. Anointing seems to be the official sign for succession into an office. We hear about kings being anointed before their predecessors were dead. Yahwe himself sometimes

---

[1] Gressmann, op. cit., p. 231.

[2] Ibid.

takes the initiative and puts an end to a "sinful" king; a prophet designates a successor.[1] Anointing seems to mean a divine legitimation of an office, especially the king's office and the priest's office.[2] The tent shrine and other cult objects are also anointed.[3]

That which is anointed is holy to Yahwe, that which Yahwe has separated from the profane for his service. This concurs with what we have discussed as a personal quality of king, priest, and cult objects. That which is holy is a symbol of Yahwe's presence. As the holy places are locations esteemed because of the presence of Yahwe, so also is the king anointed, singled out as servant, representative, and as Yahwe among his people. When we consider the role of the king for the corporate whole, and to what an extent the quality of the king determines the well-being of the people, we discover the importance of the king as Yahwe among Israel. This role of the king as corporate whole reveals to us only something of the "messianic" significance of the Jerusalem king.

Is there any messianic hope in the northern kingdom, Israel? As far as we know, the cultic role of the king in the north was not by far so well developed as that of the

---

[1] 1 Kings 19:16.

[2] Exodus 28:41; 29:7.

[3] Exodus 29:36; 30:26; 40f.

king in Jerusalem. The New Years festival did not play the same role. It was just a New Years festival and it is doubtful whether it had ever been the main feast in the north. Rather, the Passover may have kept its original superior position. The messianic expectation, which in the south rested on the "eschatological" hope that the end carried a new beginning in itself, or in other words the cyclical renewal of the assurance of salvation, was not known in the north. The messianic hope also was not tied to one dynasty as it was in Jerusalem. The emphasis was not on continuity. If there was any messianic hope at all it would be the same as it had been frequently in the past: Yahwe will choose a new man from some tribe in Israel as his anointed instead of the old king, and he will succeed the old king on the throne. It may be that the new anointed one was expected to be gifted with more gifts than the old, and therefore promise a better reign.[1]

In Isaiah 7:14 the birth of a messianic child is announced. His name is Immanuel, and the text offers "God with us" as the meaning of this name. Apparently the prophet does not understand this child to be a member of the house of David. Besides his name this is a second peculiarity. The prophecy in verses 13-17 should be against Jerusalem, for Ahaz refused to demand a sign from

---

[1] Psalm 80:18; cf. also Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 134.

Yahwe, an act of pious hypocrisy. It is even more remarkable that this passage stands in the context of the Syro-Ephraimitic war.[1] Jerusalem was hard pressed by Israel and the Syrians. The prophet Isaiah recommended to "hold fast and you shall stand fast", or in another translation, "if you will not believe, you shall not be established".[2]

The prophet Isaiah recommends faith as the best weapon, asking complete passivity on the side of Ahaz. This seems to be prophetic utopianism. We are reminded of the same attitude in the holy wars, where the armies of Israel were not the main agent; they were sometimes deliberately held small in number in order to emphasize the miracle of Yahwe's help. It was Yahwe who acted and defeated Israel's enemies. The recommendation in Isaiah 7:9b is a word which reflects the attitude of holy war. It leaves everything to Yahwe. No matter how strong the enemies, do not worry; Yahwe will act. God was with Israel in holy wars either in the person of a charismatic leader or in the symbol of the ark.

"God with us" was the hope of Israel as it had always been. Ahaz refused the sign; his faith was different from the "old faith". He could not ask for the miracle of Yahwe's action. The holy war was abandoned. It had

---

[1] Isaiah 7:1ff.

[2] Isaiah 7:9b, American Translation and Revised Standard Version respectively.

been replaced by modern military strategy. Did Ahaz know what sign he was supposed to ask for? He could not. "God with us" was the sign, but Ahaz was hardly able to understand it. Yahwe was king and "God with us" was Yahwe leading his people. Faith in the leadership of Yahwe was the prophet's advice. Yahwe would act as he had acted before. The king should trust the true king. Thus we may conclude that messianic hope was really the hope for Yahwe's kingship.

The kings in north and south forfeited their sonship because they were not true servants. Anointed meant designated for an office. The anointed in Jerusalem secularized warfare and adjusted to foreign kingships. The king understood himself as a sovereign with a supporting cult, not as an official of Yahwe. The whole realm of politics was dismissed as being secular. The cult could sacrifice, pray, and divine for the purpose of victory, but for the unmediated action of Yahwe there was no longer any place. The same was true to a certain degree for Israel, the northern kingdom, although we assume that the old traditions were more alive here than in the south, as evidenced by the history of the monarchy in the north.

CHAPTER III

THE PROPHETS

CHAPTER III

THE PROPHETS

Extra-biblical Evidence for the Existence of Prophets

> "Now while he was making offering to his gods, the god seized one of his youths and made him possessed. And he said to him: "Bring up (the) god ! Bring the messenger who is carrying him! Amon is the one who sent him out! He is the one who made him come."[1]

This report from Byblos stems from the time of c. 1100 and is not the only incident of a "prophet" appearing as a messenger of his god. The Mari texts (c. 1700) offer another example, which unfortunately is only in fragmentary condition: Kibri-Dagan reports to the king (Zimri-Lim) that a man of the god Dagan came to him and said, "The god Dagan has sent me saying: send to your lord...," and then follows the specific message.[2] In both incidents we find a man sent by his god appearing suddenly with a certain message.

---

[1] ANET, p. 26, "The Journey of Wen-Amon to Phoenicia." "A great boy of his great boys" is the literal translation of "youths", and this probably means a court page or royal guard. The determinative of the word "prophetically possessed" shows a man in violent motion or epileptic convulsion (see footnote 13, p. 26 of ANET).

[2] Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 237.

The similarity between these messengers and the Old Testament prophets is clear. Both declare themselves to be messengers of their god. They introduce their message with the same formula: thus speaks Yahwe. With this introduction the messengers legitimate themselves.[1] "The god Dagan has sent me" is the legitimation of the messenger in Mari. Noth tries to find the connection between the prophets of the Old Testament and the "prophets" of Mari.[2] The incidents cited belong in the pre-history of Old Testament prophetism. But where is the connection? The only answer Noth can give is that the prophets of Israel have their roots in pre-Israelite traditions as much as the Israelite cult has its roots in the pre-Israelite Canaanite traditions.[3]

The character of the "prophets" in Mari and Byblos is different from the character of Old Testament prophets where the content of their messages is concerned. In Mari and Byblos these messages have very limited cultic or political interest or importance. In Israel the prophets are - to say the least - skeptical towards the cult, and the realm of the holy is for the Old Testament prophets not the realm to which Yahwe's actions are limited. Never

---

[1] Jeremiah 26.

[2] Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 239.

[3] Ibid., p. 242.

is their ecstatic experience used as legitimation by the Old Testament prophets.[1] Yahwe used the prophets to proclaim his word in decisive hours of Israel's history to announce the coming event, evaluate them, and explain them as Yahwe's acting in Israel. The Old Testament prophets could not prevent the fact that besides themselves there were also "false prophets", who acted in very much the same manner as they did and claimed the same authority for their messages.

Considering the origin of prophetism we have to observe that we do not hear very much about prophets in the time before the monarchy.[2] The prophets thus appear in the same moment that the monarchy is established, but it is a hesitant appearance. It is not until the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. that we hear more from them. One is tempted to combine the loss of the status of the Levites with the rise of prophetism. They had some things in common where the content of their messages was concerned. On the other hand, the change in the Levites' role takes place under David and Solomon, while the prophets are still in the background at that time.

Changes in history, of course, do not happen at once, but develop slowly. The political situation, combined

---

[1] 1 Kings 22:10 refers to cult prophets.

[2] Judges 6:8 is a single text and cannot carry the weight of argument.

with cultic security enjoyed in Jerusalem and possibly in the northern capital also, may be responsible for the new voice of Prophetism. It is the purpose of our investigation not only to illuminate the relationship between cult and prophets but also if possible to illuminate the "origin" or the motivation of the rise of the unique phenomenon of Israelite prophets. They were unique because never anywhere again in history do we find anything comparable. The incidents in Byblos and Mari are technical parallels and no more.

The Beginning of Prophetism in Israel: the Seer

1 Samuel 9:9 tells us that in ancient times the prophet was called a seer (ראה).[1] Pedersen finds in the seer Samuel a parallel to the Arabic kahin, to whom people could go at any time to "see" for them.[2] Usually payment was made for such service. But Samuel apparently was a more complex character than a seer. The term חזה usually is considered to be a parallel to ראה .[3] The seer is the receiver of oracles, for Yahwe opens his ear.[4] It seems that the seer had a way of receiving oracles which varied from that of the priest. For the priest we have to assume technical means for the achievement of an oracle.[5] The seer received the word of Yahwe through visions.[6]

We find that the term ראה and חזה are

---

[1] Theodore H. Robinson, Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel (London: Duckworth, 1948), p. 35; Hempel, Gott und Mensch..., p. 125; Pedersen, op. cit., I-II, p. 157.

[2] Pedersen, op. cit., I-II, p. 157.

[3] Isaiah 28:7; 2 Samuel 15:27.

[4] 1 Samuel 9:15.

[5] Genesis 4:5; Ezekiel 21:26; 2 Samuel 5:23; Numbers 5:11ff.; Genesis 15:11ff.; Ezekiel 21:26.

[6] חזון 1 Samuel 3:1; Micah 3:6; Jeremiah 14:14; 23:16; Isaiah 29:7. חזות in 2 Samuel 7:17; Joel 3:1; Genesis 15:1; Numbers 24:4,16. We find connection of vision and dreams in Micah 3:6; Jeremiah 23:16; Isaiah 29:7, etc.

used for the prophetic reception of oracles. The question is whether we can detect any difference in the usage of these terms. Does ראה mean a true and real seeing as compared with חזה as the subjective pretended seeing?[1] The prophets frequently use ראה for their own visions while they use חזה for the visions of their enemies.[2] But this distinction is superficial. The cited texts are late and we find the two terms used for true and "false" prophets.[3]

The seer certainly is older than the prophets. If Pedersen should be right in assuming a Canaanite origin for the prophets, the seer would be the genuine Israelite form of receiving oracles.[4] Pedersen unfortunately is able to support the Canaanite origin only with the derivation of the verb *nb'h* from a Canaanite root which does exist in Hebrew, but this is not enough. We hear that Samuel is called a "man of God",[5] but he is also a priest.[6] In

---

[1] Johannes Hänel, *Das Erkennen Gottes bei den Schriftpropheten* (Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1923), p. 7.

[2] Ezekiel 13:6ff.; 21:34; Zechariah 10:2; Isaiah 44:9.

[3] Cf. Baalim: Numbers 24:17: חזה ; Isaiah 30:10. ראה and חזה designate the prophets in their totality. Amos (7:12) is addressed as חזה by the high priest Amaziah, and Amos had no objections to being called a חזה. Cf. Isaiah 1:1; 2:1; 13:1; Amos 1:1; Micah 1:1; Habbakuk 1:1.

[4] Pedersen, *op. cit.*, I-II, p. 9.

[5] 1 Samuel 9:6.

[6] 1 Samuel 3:21; 9:13.

Samuel we have therefore the merger of two forms of revelation: Samuel the seer is the recipient of oracles via the technical means of urim and thummim[1] or through the ark.

Samuel was introduced into the Levitical priesthood by the Levitical priest Eli, who was the priest at the ark sanctuary at Shiloh. Is it incidentally that Samuel received his vision in the moment that the ark is lost to the Philistines? Does the tradition say to us that with the loss of the ark the line of communication with Yahwe is not broken?[2] Samuel then would have been a Levitical priest deprived of the presence of Yahwe as symbolized in the ark. Other means of "divinization" must be found.

There is still another solution. This proposal is connected with the problem of the relationship between office and charisma.[3] Samuel as the "unvoluntary" recipient of divine oracles was a charismatic; Samuel the priest was a "technician". Apparently, in the beginning of the development of seer and prophet the relationship between charisma and office was not considered a problem. It was a matter of course that among the priesthood there were men

---

[1] 1 Samuel 10:20ff.(?).

[2] Otto Ploger, "Priester und Prophet," ZAW, LXIII (1951), p. 164.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 101.

who were gifted with the spirit of Yahwe. Samuel was a charismatic priest who was also called a prophet because the Lord revealed himself to him.[1] Those priests who were also charismatics must have occupied an important role. Samuel's standing, of course, is emphasized by the fact that he is priest of the sanctuary of the ark, the traditional place of Yahwe's revelation. In this position Samuel anoints the king and guides the people.

Samuel certainly was not the only charismatic priest in Israel. There were more, and they might have separated themselves from the priesthood at a certain point. A date for this separation may have been when the ark went up to Jerusalem and came under the care of the Zadokite priests.[2] The Levites changed the emphasis of their priestly function. They taught torah and preserved the traditions. The charismatic branch of the Levitical priesthood became independently a movement or "order".

---

[1] 1 Samuel 3:20.

[2] The office of the mediator had become one of the royal offices. Because the kings do not prove worthy of this office, the prophets claim it for themselves (cf. Hentschke, op. cit., p. 139). In the Elohistic work we possess a tradition which tries to explain the origin of the nebiim, Numbers 11:24ff. Moses threatens to break down under the burden of his mediatorship. Then God calls 70 men to the tent (!) and takes a little of Moses' ruah, distributing it among the 70. They immediately are seized by the Spirit and show all symptoms of prophetic enthusiasm. The purpose of this tradition is the Mosaic legitimation of prophetism. Two men who had not been in the tent are seized also. That means E reckons with the prophets, who are not connected with any cult.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The original unity of the three, priest, seer, and prophet, split up into two, priest and prophet.[1] The seer lost his individual character and merged completely with the prophet.[2] Perhaps it is possible to support the thesis of the Levitical origin of the Israelite prophets through the content of the message of these prophets. We discussed already one example, Isaiah 7:9b. If it is true that this passage includes the idea of the holy war, we would have a Levitical element in prophetic message.

The "great" prophets and the "false" prophets have the same origin but undergo a different development. We can only explain the "great" prophets through their rootage in the basic traditions of the amphictyonic existence of Israel.[3] They all had this in common in spite of the different emphasis which we find in the north and in the south: they all tried to regain the whole realm of the political, which had been usurped by the kingship, for the faith of Israel. The prophets preached against alliances and armament politics, against the syncretistic Yahwe faith, and against economic and social disorder. Where do we find the bearers of true Yahwism in a time when Israel seems to

---

[1] Hentschke, op. cit., p. 137. Before Samuel we do not hear anything about nebiim orders or groups. After Samuel we meet groups of nebiim (1 Samuel 10:6,5). Elijah and Elisha stand in the center of this movement.

[2] Amos 7:10-15; 1 Samuel 9:9.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 74.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

have left Yahwe? We have to look at the Levites to find those responsible for the preservation of Yahwism. They formed a strong group which ultimately should precede the Josianic reform and provide this reform with its theological legitimation.

The other important element without which we cannot understand the "great" prophets is the historical-political development in the Near East during the eighth and seventh centuries.[1] The expansion of the tribes in Palestine was only possible because the strength of the three major powers declined. Since the twelfth century B.C. Egypt was no longer able to keep up its supremacy over Palestine. At the same time, the kingdom of the Hittites was destroyed by the "sea-people". Assyria also experienced a sharp downfall, but soon recovered. At first it did not direct its attention towards Palestine. Tiglath-pileser III (745-727) was the first to turn west and in 733 the kingdom of Israel was defeated by him. In 721 Samaria was conquered, and Sennacherib conquered Jerusalem in 701.[2] Beginning with the middle of the seventh century Assyria's power declined and was succeeded by Babylonia, which ended the independence of Judah in 597 and 587.

The "great" prophets understood the events of history as the acting of Yahwe. Israel should meet Yahwe in a new way; these events provided a new encounter.[3]

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 73.
[2] 2 Kings 15:29f.; 18:13-16.
[3] Micah 1:2-5.

Nebiim: Office or Charisma?

One of the problems in a discussion of "true" and "false" prophets is the question of their cultic ties: in other words, the question of office and charisma. Is it possible to show that the majority of prophets fulfill a function in the cult, or is their main characteristic free inspiration? A third possibility would be that the cult made the free inspiration of prophets useful to cultic service.

The Hebrew did not know a special word for "false" prophets.[1] The attitude of the "great" prophets towards their "false" brothers is not unanimous. Micaiah ben Imlah considered the prophets as seized by Yahwe; Jeremiah had no answer to the prophecy of Hananiah. Micah ben Moresheth despised the nebiim because they were not free, and Jeremiah condemns nebiim for their message of unconditional salvation.[2] Although Jeremiah accuses his enemies sometimes of moral violations,[3] it would be an oversimplification to say that the "false" prophets had lower morals than the "great" prophets. A story like the encounter between Jeremiah and Hananiah dismissed the argument on

---

[1] The Septuagint in Jeremiah likes to speak about φευδοπροφήτης : 6:13; 26:7; 26:8,11,26; 27:9; 28:1.

[2] Jeremiah 6:14; 14:13; 23:9-32.

[3] Jeremiah 23:14.

morals.[1] Both were prophets of Yahwe, and the way they appear and proclaim their word, together with accompanying prophetic actions, is very much the same.

Opinions about the institutional character and the free character of prophets vary widely. Mowinckel once considered prophets as cult functionaries parallel to the common ancient eastern phenomenon of ecstatic cult personnel.[2] Others are more reluctant to put all men who are called prophets in the same class. They begin by pointing out the apparent witness of our texts to wide differences between individual figures among the prophets. If there should be a distinction made between the prophets, this would have to be done on the basis of their message.[3]

We found Samuel, the first important prophetic figure which we meet in the Old Testament, performing priestly functions. We find prophets imparting torah, which is also a priestly function.[4] How much were the prophets connected with groups; how much did they live in orders? When Saul is seized by the ruah of Yahwe he is

---

[1] Jeremiah 28.

[2] Mowinckel, Religion und Kultus, p. 57.

[3] Gerhard von Rad, "Die falschen Propheten," ZAW, LI (1933), p. 112; Hentschke, op. cit., p. 166; Ploger, ZAW, LXIII (1951), pp. 165ff.

[4] Cf. Isaiah 8:16; 1:10-17; 2 Kings 4:38; 6:1: the sons of the prophet "sit before the prophet". To sit before depicts the position of the pupil before the teacher. Torah is taught here. Cf. Östborn, op. cit., p. 132.

infected by the enthusiasm of a band of prophets which comes down from a bamah.[1] Samuel himself probably had disciples. We know for sure that both Elijah and Elisha had disciples, and Isaiah also; if we count Baruch as a disciple Jeremiah also had at least one.

These groups of nebiim may have been free, wandering through the country, or may have been stationed at one particular sanctuary.[2] Pedersen suggests that they constituted a part of the staff of the temple.[3] The role of the prophet Nathan at the court in Jerusalem is well known. Is he a "false" prophet or a "true" one? Equally difficult is the judgment on Micaiah ben Imlah, who seems to have been a "true" prophet, but available for the inquiry of the king. Micaiah ben Imlah distinguished himself from Zedekiah and his band of prophets through the character of his message, which was doom.[4]

How is this variety of forms to be explained as one phenomenon? Is it possible to understand all prophets as different branches of one root? In the beginning there certainly was an individual prophet, a man seized by Yahwe and gifted with Yahwe's spirit. Samuel was such a man.

---

[1] 1 Samuel 10:5.

[2] Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 111; Hosea 9:8; Jeremiah 23:11.

[3] Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 117; Jeremiah 29:26; 20:6; 1:1; Ezekiel 1:3; Isaiah 3:2ff.

[4] 1 Kings 22:8.

He combined in himself different functions: he was seer, priest, and prophet. In other words, he combined office and charisma. We suggested that the prophets stem from charismatic Levitical priests. These men supplemented the priestly function of teaching torah and preserving traditions by the charisma of receiving direct word from Yahwe. Sometimes this word came when asked, sometimes without being asked, but they spoke when the spirit came over them.

It is a characteristic of charisma that it comes and vanishes. If it is highly valued, men will try to preserve or even to induce it. We hear about techniques which brought enthusiasm and ecstasy upon the prophets. Usually these practices were experienced and exercised by a group, not by an individual. Ecstasy is something which infects not only one but many. We have to say that the group is the distortion of something which originally may have been confined to an individual, restricted to one who was seized by the spirit of Yahwe without any preparation or pre-conditioning. Because of parallel purposes, priest and prophet stood close together. Both proclaimed the will of Yahwe, the priest by means of the covenantal torah, the prophet through a dabar direct from Yahwe.

Charisma cannot be taught. When Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah had groups of disciples around them, we have to reckon with a change in the character of prophecy. Charisma

is something which appears here and there. It cannot be guided or forced to locate itself at any place or in any person, if it is supposed to be the true spirit of Yahwe. We observe in Israel what can be observed again and again in the history of the church: all phenomena, no matter how individual and uncontrolled they are, become institutionalized. It is this process which we can observe in Israel. Yahwe, who seizes a man here and there without rule or regularity, is forced to put this spirit in the service of religion.

The stronger religion and cult became in Israel and Judah, the more frequently groups of prophets appeared. In the beginning it was no problem to have priest and prophet combined in one person. For Nathan we cannot find a label, but the institutionalization had already begun. No matter whether we find the groups of prophets explicitly connected with a sanctuary or find them in the service of the king, we have to consider the group a distortion of the original phenomenon.

That it is impossible to seize or limit the spirit of Yahwe or the charisma is the extraordinary experience which we observe in Israel. The men whom we call "great" prophets were independent and were seized by the spirit without the appliance of mantic techniques.[1] Their independence is attested to by their message. The

---

[1] Cf. Amos 7:14. Amos considers it necessary to name נביא and בן־נביא separately. This may indicate

charisma was dwelling in "great" prophets. All other kinds of prophets may have claimed the authority of Yahwe, but only history can judge them. Many of them occupied some office such as diviners and "seers" in the same sense that Greek "seers" were used by their lords. Some of them pretended to be free and delighted in their free form, but the form was empty because the spirit was not there. We cannot count them under office; they do not belong in either category.

---

two different kinds of prophets. The outstanding personalities of the prophets have to be distinguished from the groups which are dependent upon them. Amos denies that he belongs to either of these groups.

The Cultic Functions of the _Nebiim_

After Samuel offered the sacrifice before he anointed David[1] and Elijah repaired the altar, we never again hear of a prophet offering sacrifices for the community. David offered a sacrifice himself,[2] and so did his son Solomon at the dedication of the temple.[3]

Possibly the only cultic function of the prophets was "to call upon the name of Yahwe". This function resulted from the mediation of the prophets. They were qualified as intercessors, or specialists in prayer, just as priests were specialists in sacrifice.[4] This is an oversimplification, but we shall see what it means. 2 Kings 4:23 records the custom of visiting a prophet regularly at new moon or sabbath. How much this reflects a _cult_ custom or just a popular custom is difficult to decide. It is just as difficult to decide whether or not "to call upon Yahwe" was a cultic function.

Our texts emphasize the prophetic ability to pray for their people. This ability seems to be based upon the

---

[1] 1 Samuel 16:5.

[2] 2 Samuel 6:17.

[3] 1 Kings 8:62f. Cf. also Buber, _Prophetic Faith_, p. 81.

[4] Aubrey R. Johnson, _The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel_ (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1944), p. 50.

prophets' close relationship to Yahwe.[1] An unknown prophet, a "man of God", prays for King Jeroboam's hand to be restored.[2] In 1 Kings 17:20 Elijah restores the life of a boy by crying to the Lord. The ability and willingness to intercede on behalf of the people of Jerusalem is attested for Jeremiah and Isaiah.[3] Von Rad concludes therefore that the role of the intercessor as a cultic function of the prophets must have been rooted so deeply in the prophetic existence that even a man like Jeremiah considered himself obligated on this point. But Jeremiah is also the best example that his obligation to intercede was not the essence of his message. Even in his prayers for the people the message of doom shines through. It was not his desire to bring the "fatal day" upon the people.[4] His prayer could not overcome the message which

---

[1] Already in old sources we discover the prophet as intercessor. Genesis 20:7,17: Abraham is called a prophet and his being a prophet is closely connected with his intercession for Abimelech. In Genesis 18:22-23 Abraham prays for Sodom. It is striking that not Lot but Abraham prays, although Lot had the most interest in the saving action (cf. Nils Johansson, *Parakletoi* (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1940), p. 4. Isaac prays for his wife Rebeccah (Genesis 25:21. Cf. also Moses as intercessor in Exodus 8:4; 9:28ff.; 10:16-19). In Numbers 16:20-22 Aaron assists Moses in his intercessory prayer. This presumes the later main function of the high priest in praying for people; for Deuteronomy, Moses is *the* intercessor.

[2] 1 Kings 13:6.

[3] Jeremiah 37:3; 42:2; 7:16; 27:18; 2 Kings 18:13ff.; 19:1ff.

[4] Jeremiah 17:16.

Yahwe put in his mouth. He curses his enemies which persecute him,[1] and prays for the vengeance of Yahwe.[2]

It is difficult to understand the "great" prophets as cult functionaries even when they pray for the people. A message of salvation does not mean salvation yet. For the great prophet salvation is a result of judgment, in other words an eschatological reality and not a cultic one.[3] We can assume a cultic function for those groups of prophets which are connected with the cult, but we cannot accept the unconditional statement of Johnson "that the prophet, as a professional figure, was as much a

---

[1] Jeremiah 17:18.

[2] Jeremiah 20:12. Cf. also Isaiah 1:15, where Isaiah condemns, among other features of the cult, prayers. Yahwe will not listen to the prayers. It is not clear whether this verse is directed against prayers delivered in the rituals of the cult or whether Isaiah addresses the cult prophets. The context seems to suggest the former, but certainly we have to include the praying of the cult prophets in this condemnation. Although intercessory prayer seems to have been one cultic function of the prophets, intercessory prayer certainly was also delivered by priests in pre-exilic Israel.

[3] There is a sharp distinction between prophetic salvation and cultic salvation. As we shall see later in our discussion, about Deutero-Isaiah, judgment and salvation are closely connected. Isaiah's theology of the remnant (chapters 6-8; cf. Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., IV, pp. 206ff.), clearly shows the twofold determination of the remnant. In the remnant salvation and judgment meet. The remnant is a result of Yahwe's judgment on his people and therefore is the symbol of salvation (cf. 2 Kings 19:31; Isaiah 10:21; 37:32; Micah 4:7). Into the same category with the remnant belongs the people of the new covenant in Jeremiah (cf. Jeremiah 31:27ff.).

representative of the people as the spokesman of Yahwe..."[1] The prophet certainly was foremost a spokesman of Yahwe. He had to proclaim the dabar of Yahwe even when it proved fatal for his own people.

The above-mentioned passage from Jeremiah illustrates clearly the priority of the demand of Yahwe over intercession for the people. Jeremiah experiences that the possibility to intercede is taken from him.[2] He has to fight against the prophets who proclaim the immunity of Jerusalem.[3] Even those prophets of peace and salvation, however, may not have been officials of the cult in the same way as the priests were officials of the cult. In 1 Kings 22:10 we find four hundred prophets assembled in the gate of Samaria, which is hardly a place for cultic functions.[4]

---

[1] Johnson, The Cultic Prophet..., p. 51.

[2] Jeremiah 7:16.

[3] Jeremiah 14:13; cf. also Micah 3:11.

[4] Von Rad, ZAW, LXIII (1951), p. 115.

The Criticism of "Great" Prophets Against "False" Prophets

Against the message of salvation. In our discussion of the monarchy in Jerusalem and the temple cult, we have discovered the emphasis on the salvatory character of the Jerusalem cult. The house of David had an everlasting covenant with Yahwe and Yahwe had chosen Mount Zion as his dwelling place. Through this type of cult the people rested in a feeling of security and therefore did not understand threatening signs which appeared on the political horizon. This attitude of the people is even supported by those prophets who are connected with the cult in some form, if not through the content of their message. The whole complex of Jerusalem theology, as for example the Zion hymns,[1] reflect the attitude of the people very clearly.

We know the content of the messages of the prophets of salvation through the utterances of their enemies; the "great" prophets battled with their message of doom the popular belief in the everlastingness of the covenant of Yahwe with the house of David. "Is not the Lord in the midst of us? No misfortune can befall us."[2] "God is with us",[3]

---

[1] Psalm 46.

[2] Micah 3:11.

[3] Isaiah 8:10; Cf. also Amos 5:14 and Isaiah 7:14.

"No harm shall befall us"[1] reflect the attitude of the people.[2]

For the prophets the election out of Egypt was nothing for the people to be proud of;[3] instead it was an obligation.[4] Because of the predominance of the message of doom, the "great" prophets have called their adversaries "prophets of salvation".[5] In Isaiah 28:14-22 we find an ironic prophecy against the prophets of salvation who celebrated the defeat of foreign nations because this defeat would not affect them.[6] But Isaiah does not

---

[1] Jeremiah 5:12; cf. also 7:4,10.

[2] Yahwe had elected them in the beginning when he liberated them out of Egypt, and he would do so again. The covenant was secured through precise cultic enactment.

[3] Amos 9:7.

[4] Amos 4:12. However, the influence of Canaanite cyclical thinking, which knew the end only as the moment before the new beginning, was strong in Israel. As certain as after the drought would come rain- or in mythological language, as long as Baal would defeat Moth - so certain was it that Yahwe would renew the covenant with his people. (Cf. Hosea 6:1-3, which probably is a cult hymn, belonging perhaps into the New Years festival with its fertility implications, the death and resurrection of Adonis. Cf. Theodore H. Robinson and Friedrich Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938), p. 44. To Baal also belonged these motifs (cf. Ugaritic mythology of the death and resurrection of Aleyan Baal.).)

For Judah and Jerusalem the covenant could not be severed; Yahwe had made an everlasting covenant with David.

[5] Jeremiah 14:12-16; 23:9-40; 27:1-28:17; 29:15,21-33; Ezekiel 13; Hosea 4:5; Isaiah 3:2; 28:7; Micah 3:5-8; Amos 7:14; 2 Kings 20.

[6] Because of the cultic significance of Death (Sheol) in Egypt we interpret the "covenant with Death" (Isaiah 28:15a) as refering to a covenant between Judah and Egypt. (For the

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

assume salvation for Jerusalem. The flood will not stop before Jerusalem, or even before Mount Zion. Yahwe destroys his own sanctuary.[1]

---

religious significance of Death and life after death, see as illustration in the portion from "Book of the Dead", *ANET*, pp. 34ff.) The "overwhelming scourge" in Isaiah 28:15b we understand as refering to Assyria. What is the historical situation forming the background for this message of Isaiah? There are two possibilities (cf. for the following Noth, *Geschichte Israels*, pp. 239-243). Ahaz had surrendered to the Assyrians in 733 B.C. During the years 713-711 B.C. anti-Assyrian activities began in the Philistean city of Ashdod. Sargon on a prism fragment tells us that besides the Philistines, Judah under Hezekiah, Edom, and Moab joined also the anti-Assyrian alliance. The alliance received the help of Pharaoh Shabaka (cf. Isaiah 18:1-6; 20:1-6). Sargon appeared three years later and defeated the rebellion in Ashdod. The other members of the alliance apparently left the alliance and except for tribute received no punishment.

The other possibility for dating Isaiah 28:14ff. is the rebellion Hezekiah led in 705 B.C. when he "reformed" the cult in Jerusalem, removing the Assyrian cult features from the temple, thus demonstrating the break of the relationship between Judah and Assyria. Hezekiah had allies in his undertaking: Ashkalon, Ekron, Shabaka of Egypt (Isaiah 30:1-5; 31:1-3), and even Merodach-baladan of Babylonia (2 Kings 20:12-19). Sennacherib defeated the Egyptians at Eltekeh and then easily conquered Judah. Only Jerusalem was able to hold out and saved herself through heavy tribute (Isaiah 1:4-9; 2 Kings 18:13-16). Sennacherib limited the kingdom of Hezekiah to the small city state of Jerusalem. The prophecy of Isaiah became only half true for the time being. The scourge passed Jerusalem but swept the country. Furthermore the situation signified the beginning of the end with reference to Merodach-baladan. The end of Assyria only marked the beginning of the new deadly threat: the exile by the Babylonians.

[1] In Isaiah 28:16-17 we meet the remnant in the metaphor of the cornerstone. As we have observed for the remnant, here also in Isaiah 28:16-17 salvation and judgment meet. (cf. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch...*, IV, p. 215.) The cornerstone is a well tested stone. This means that Yahwe's grace is not cheap grace; the cornerstone, as the remnant also, has to be tested, to go through the cleansing fire, which is the judgment of Yahwe. The combination of judgment and salvation is no paradox. It is a necessity

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Micaiah ben Imlah accuses the prophets of lying. It is even worse; Yahwe himself has put the lying spirit in their mouth.[1] After having consulted four hundred of his prophets, the king of Israel asks for Micaiah, who never "prophesies good concerning me, but only evil."[2] Micaiah's message is evil as opposed to the message of the four hundred, which is positive. Micaiah denies that the prophets have the right insight into the will of Yahwe; they deceive Ahab because Yahwe made it impossible for them to see the truth. This story also shows some distrust in the value of ecstasy as a means of revelation. King Jehoshaphat wants to hear Micaiah although he could be satisfied with the message of the four hundred.[3]

---

in the encounter of Yahwe and his people (as it is in the encounter of Yahwe and man; Isaiah 6:5-6). That our interpretation is right is attested in Isaiah 28:17. Righteousness - and that of course is the righteousness of Yahwe - shall be the criterion. The remnant and the cornerstone are Yahwe's right, that which belongs to him. The unrighteousness of the people (the covenant with death) stands against the righteousness of Yahwe (Isaiah 6:5-6; and note the emphasis on faith as the way to salvation in 7:9b and 28:16b. Faith is trust in Yahwe, in his covenant.).

[1] 1 Kings 22:22.

[2] 1 Kings 22:8.

[3] 1 Kings 22:7. Possibly Jehoshaphat was reluctant to get involved in this campaign and because he would not benefit, questioned. Therefore he made use of the possibility of inquiry through Micaiah. Perhaps Jehoshaphat knew that Micaiah would not support the campaign and hoped for reluctance of the king of Israel when he heard the message of Micaiah.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The clearest picture and the most violent opposition against prophets of salvation we find in Jeremiah. The battle is so violent because for Jeremiah his own legitimation is at stake. The prophets whom he encounters claim Yahwe's authority for their message as much as he claims Yahwe's authority for his own. They cry "peace, peace" when there is no peace.[1] He finds the sharpest words for the prophets of Jerusalem who spread ungodliness all through the land (Ch. 23, v.15). They fill the people with vain hopes, but they do not proclaim the word of Yahwe, but visions out of their own minds (v.16). No harm shall come to Judah, they prophesy (v.17). Yahwe did not seize those prophets, but they act as though he did. The criterion of a true message from Yahwe would be that they turn the people from their evil course (v.22). But instead they make the people forget Yahwe by telling their dreams, which have no authority. The people have left Yahwe just as their fathers left Yahwe in favor of Baal (v.27).

Jeremiah denies the prophets any connection with Yahwe. They are really prophets of Baal.[2] The prophets prophesy shalom because "my people loved to have it so."[3]

---

[1] Jeremiah 6:14; cf. also 14:13.

[2] Jeremiah 2:8; 23:13; 5:31; here בעל is substituted by שקר, which means essentially the same. Cf. Hentschke, op. cit., p. 159.

[3] Jeremiah 5:31b.

Priests and prophets are united in the content of their message of shalom.[1] It is clear that the difference between Jeremiah and the prophets of salvation is a difference of content, not of method.

If all prophets introduced their oracles with the same phrase, כהאמר יהוה, or נאם יהוה, it was difficult to distinguish between true and false ones. Jeremiah faces this problem of legitimation in his encounter with Hananiah, who seems to be as much a prophet of Yahwe as Jeremiah himself. Hananiah announced that Yahwe had broken the yoke of the king of Babylon, and that he would bring back King Jehoiakim with all the exiles of Judah (Ch. 28, v.1-4). Jeremiah challenges this word. History should prove whether Hananiah would be right or not (v.9). Hananiah, to give emphasis to his oracle, turned the sign of Jeremiah around. He broke the yoke which Jeremiah was carrying on his neck and used it as a sign for his purpose. As I broke this yoke, said Hananiah, the Lord will break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon (v.11).

Finally we have to consider the so-called oracles against the nations.[2] Frequently these oracles are deleted because of their character, which does not seem to fit the time and content of a prophet's message. We should be careful, however, in deleting these oracles as late. It is

---

[1] Jeremiah 6:13-15; 8:10-12; 4:9f.; 18:18; Zephaniah 3:4.

[2] Isaiah 13ff.; Amos 1:3-2:16; Micah 1.

true they show a national aspect in their expectation of salvation for Israel and Judah, and defeat for the nations which stand against Israel and Judah.[1] We have to disagree with Ploger on the point that the _Gattung_ of these oracles belongs to the institutional _nebiim_. It is clear, for example, that the oracles against the nations in Amos 1:2-2:16 may reflect a prophetic technique, which means we should not take them literally. The prophet starts out with oracles against foreign nations, exactly like the cult _nebiim_. Suddenly he turns around and delivers oracles against Israel. We have to depict the delivery of these oracles as possibly during the celebration of a major cult festival. The prophet stood up and started to speak. The people stood around him, cheering for defeat of their enemies. Then comes the turn: Amos speaks against them.[2]

Against mantic methods and techniques. The Hebrew word for prophet, נביא, is derived from a root which is not genuine Hebrew but is common to a number of other Near Eastern languages.[3] The Old Testament phenomenon of

---

[1] Ploger, _ZAW_, LXIII (1951), p. 117.

[2] F. Hesse, "Wurzelt die prophetische Gerichtsrede im israelitischen Kult?" _ZAW_, LXV (1953), p. 49. Even if we accept the non-authenticity of some of the oracles in Amos 1:2-2:16 (for example 1:1; 1:1-12; 2:4-5), the passage is still a valid illustration for the point made, since several passages are left as authentic to preceed the last oracle against Israel.

[3] In Sabaic, נבא, meaning to call out. In Assyrian, _nabu_, meaning to shout, proclaim, call; in Ethiopian and _Arabian_ meaning to bark, bark shortly. The noun נביא can mean "to utter suddenly, under deep breathing". Cf. Gesenius, _op. cit._, p. 478, Johnson, _op. cit._, p. 24, and Buber, _Prophetic Faith_, p. 63.

prophetism seems to belong to a category of men which we find active in the same ecstatic way all over the ancient Near East.[1] In Canaan, Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and other places we find nebiim as proclaimers of divine words, oracles, and, eventually, divine messages.

In 1 Samuel 10:5 a band of prophets comes down from a bamah playing lutes and pipes; inspired by the sound of their music, they "prophesy" ecstatically. Buber considers this "prophesying" ecstatically as the enthusiastic singing of monotonous songs; he does not want to think of it as disorderly and inarticulate sounds.[2] The content of the "prophesying", however, is not known to us in this case. The text does not allow us any knowledge of the content. The only thing we hear is that Yahwe's spirit seized these men, just as it seized Saul when he came in contact with these nebiim. This certainly means that Saul joined the nebiim in showing the marks of violent ecstatic conduct.

Men whom we consider "great" prophets and nebiim must have had something in common, otherwise it would not be understandable that the same term is used for both. Nabi and nebiim must have had the same origin, or at least to the people the behavior of the nabi must have been similar to that of the nebiim. Why was the term "seer"

---

[1] Mowinckel, Religion und Kultus, p. 56.

[2] Buber, Prophetic Faith, p. 63.

dropped in favor of the term nabi, if there was no relationship between the appearance of the seer-nabi and nebiim? Buber is certainly right when he suggests that the singular nabi has a different meaning than the plural nebiim. As for the nebiim, Buber says that the "decisive movement goes out from the human person towards the realm of deity, whereas with the nabi something descends from the divine sphere upon man: dabar or ruah."[1]

Nabi is an individual not connected with any group of nebiim as a source of ecstasy. Nabi does not denote a class or a profession but a condition.[2] From time to time the spirit comes upon these men and they experience in some way the same thing that the nebiim do. The spirit of Yahwe comes over both nabi and nebiim. In early times we find a positive appreciation of nebiim.[3] Furthermore, there are some figures which stand in the midst of the development of adversity between "great" prophets and nebiim. Elisha employed ecstatic means to achieve a word of the Lord.[4] Again as in 1 Samuel 10 we find musical instruments as a means of achieving ecstasy. Was Elisha a nabi or did he belong to the nebiim? He was the leader of a band of

---

[1] Buber, Prophetic Faith, p. 64.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Amos 3:7f.; 2:11. Amos counts nebiim and Nazirites a blessing of Yahwe for Israel.

[4] 2 Kings 3:15.

nebiim, so we must count him as one.[1]

The spirit of Yahwe was the legitimation of *nabi* and *nebiim*. Both experienced this spirit and both were recognized among the people through the effects of the spirit. The situation became problematic when *nabi* was opposed to *nebiim*; both claimed the same legitimation because the same spirit had seized them. Here the fight begins between those who became technicians in inducing the "spirit" by the means of music, and by cutting or punishing themselves,[2] and thus were always ready to deliver a *dabar* of Yahwe, and those who had no command over the spirit, who had to wait, and who were sometimes left without a *dabar*.[3]

Nebiim employed other means besides music and dance to induce ecstasy.[4] We mentioned earlier that the prophets of Baal slashed one another until the blood gushed out of them, and worked themselves into a prophetic frenzy.[5] Possibly we have to assume the same custom for the *nebiim* in Israel. The group character of *nebiim* furthers the induction of ecstasy. The *nebiim* used intoxicating wine.[6] They acted like children stammering

---

[1] 2 Kings 4:1ff.

[2] 1 Kings 18:26-29; Zechariah Zephaniah 13:6.

[3] Jeremiah 28:11.

[4] 1 Samuel 10:2f., 10f.; 2 Kings 3:15.

[5] 1 Kings 18:26-29.

[6] Isaiah 28:7.

incomprehensably.[1] David is depicted as acting like a prophetic madman coming to Achish.[2] The prophet who comes to Jehu is called a madman, but he is also one who proclaims the _dabar_ of Yahwe.[3]

The _nebiim_ use their technique as a profession. Micah accuses them of preaching prosperity when their mouth is filled.[4] Amos is addressed as one of the _nebiim_ who makes his living by proclaiming the _dabar_ of Yahwe.[5] Amos, however, rejects this; he is not one who can be bought. His only legitimation and impulse is to preach the _dabar_ of Yahwe to Israel, because for this purpose Yahwe had taken him from among the flocks.[6]

It is this professional prophetism, which is connected with sanctuaries such as Jerusalem,[7] which must rely on techniques of divinization and methods to induce ecstasy in order to utter words which are claimed to be words of Yahwe. Through their professionalism the _nebiim_ betrayed the original spontaniety of the word of Yahwe. They tied this word to their persons by claiming to be receivers of

---

[1] Isaiah 28:10,13.

[2] 1 Samuel 22:15.

[3] 2 Kings 9:11,12b.

[4] Micah 3:5.

[5] Amos 7:12ff.

[6] Amos 7:15.

[7] Jeremiah 23:15.

the word. In other words, to be a member of a prophetic order meant the ability to receive the word of Yahwe. Thus the true character of the word of Yahwe was threatened. The question is whether it is possible to force the appearance of a *dabar* through human initiative, or is a *dabar* dependent upon divine inspiration, which means it can only be proclaimed when it is inspired. If there is no word there is no proclamation.[1] The *nebiim* had a *dabar* in every situation.[2] And as we have seen, their *dabar* usually was a *dabar* of salvation.

1 Kings 22 shows the tragedy of the situation. *Dabar* of Yahwe stands against *dabar* of Yahwe. Here lies the reason for the bitter struggle of the "great" prophets for the soul of their people. The *nebiim* led people astray through their message of salvation, which was legitimated apparently by the spirit, the latter being achieved by the means of music, wine, and the suggestive power of group experience. *Nebiim* had the support of the cult, and frequently they were cult functionaries.[3] Except for the content and means by which they achieved the state of

---

[1] Jeremiah 28:11.

[2] 1 Kings 22:5ff.

[3] See 1 Samuel 19:19, where we find *nebiim* at the cult place of Ramah (Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien* III, p. 17). 2 Kings 2:3,5; 4:38. *Nebiim* in connection with priests: Isaiah 28:7; Jeremiah 4:9; 6:13; 14:18; 18:18; Micah 3:11; Zechariah 7:3. According to Jeremiah 29:26 the *nebiim* at the temple were supervised by a priest.

the sports. In other words, [illegible]

[illegible]

Thus the Greek classification [illegible]

The condition is somewhat [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

prophesying, the "great" prophets may not have made a much different impression from the nebiim. This made the battle even more intricate.

Scholars disagree whether or not the "great" prophets had ecstatic experiences. The expression "the hand of Yahwe" could indicate some ecstatic experience.[1] The hand of the Lord was on Elijah and he ran to Jezreel.[2] Jeremiah "sits" under the hand of Yahwe and Yahwe filled him with wrath.[3] Elisha is overcome by the hand of Yahwe when the minstrel played.[4] In Ezekiel the hand of Yahwe indicates communication of divine will, the reception of a dabar.[5] It is not entirely clear whether the expression "hand of Yahwe" means an ecstatic experience. Certainly the possibility exists. In the case of Elisha we have to reckon with ecstasy,[6] while for example it is improbable that Jeremiah has an ecstatic experience when the "hand of Yahwe" was upon him.[7]

---

[1] Hempel, Gott und Mensch..., p. 96.

[2] 1 Kings 18:46.

[3] Jeremiah 15:17b.

[4] 2 Kings 3:15.

[5] Ezekiel 3:22.

[6] 2 Kings 3:15.

[7] Jeremiah 15:17b. That Jeremiah knew ecstatic experiences seems indicated in Jeremiah 23:1; however, without using the form "hand of Yahwe" to describe the ecstatic experience.

Contrary to Hempel, Hentschke maintains that "hand of Yahwe" had nothing at all to do with ecstasy, but is a term for "overcoming" by Yahwe.[1] Yahwe overcomes human will and human resistance to force upon man his demands and threats.[2] How Yahwe overcomes human resistance is clear in the case of Jeremiah, who is forced to become a nabi against his will.[3] Such an attitude certainly does not further ecstatic experience, because Jeremiah's unwillingness hardly makes him receptive. However, when the spirit comes over him, it is a terrifying experience for the man Jeremiah.[4]

It seems that Jeremiah has known ecstasy and visions as have the other "great" prophets.[5] The difference between nabi and nebiim is that the nabi does not use his experience for legitimation as the nebiim do. Jeremiah denounces dreams as a means of revelation.[6] Also, he does not want a dabar because it makes him a laughing-stock and the people mock him.[7] But the dabar of Yahwe cannot be hidden or held back; it is like burning fire, so Jeremiah has to

---

[1] Jeremiah 20:7.

[2] Hänel, op. cit., p. 63.

[3] Jeremiah 4:19ff.; 23:9.

[4] Jeremiah 4:19ff.; 23:9.

[5] Isaiah 6; Hosea 8:1ff.; Amos 7:1ff.; 9:1ff.; Jeremiah 1:11ff.

[6] Jeremiah 23:25ff.

[7] Jeremiah 20:7ff.

utter this dabar.

In conclusion, we must emphasize the distinction Buber made as mentioned above: nabi is one who has no command over any dabar. It is something which is not available to him, not even through mantic techniques and methods. Nebiim are those who try to force the reception of a dabar by bringing themselves into a "receptive" attitude. For the nabi the initiative is Yahwe's alone, but the nebiim take initiative into their own hands. Both nabi and nebiim can be tools of the spirit of Yahwe, even if it is "only" Yahwe's lying spirit.[1]

Nebiim are not messengers of Yahwe. Again Jeremiah is our main witness against the nebiim. He denies that they are sent or commissioned by Yahwe. They never received a dabar. They preach the inventions of their own hearts.[2] The nebiim mislead the people by pretending to be sent by Yahwe.[3] Together with Judah, the "false" prophets shall perish.[4] After the conflict with Hananiah, Jeremiah announces that Yahwe will punish Hananiah with death because he falsely proclaims peace in the name of Yahwe without being sent by him.[5] To speak in the name of Yahwe

---

[1] 1 Kings 22:21ff.; Isaiah 29:10; 51:17; Jeremiah 25:15f.; Psalm 60:5; 75:9.

[2] Jeremiah 14:14.

[3] Jeremiah 23:21,32.

[4] Jeremiah 27:15.

[5] Jeremiah 28:15.

means the same as being sent by Yahwe. Both phrases claim divine authority.[1] The prophetic proclamation receives Yahwe's authority and even is considered as Yahwe's own words when introduced through a phrase according to which Yahwe is the speaker.

The criterion of whether or not a dabar is truly a dabar of Yahwe is a prophet's relationship to the preceding prophets.[2] The prophets before Jeremiah and Hananiah prophesied against nations and have prophesied famine. If a prophet is true, his dabar will be proven by history. History will decide whether the proclamation of peace and salvation was the word of Yahwe. The desires and inventions of the heart dissolve when they face the reality of history. Jeremiah propagates a new criterion. Never before in Israel's history do we hear that a prophet's word is judged by its fulfillment. No one could have objections to the "peace, peace" of the nebiim, if this "peace, peace" would be separated from the historical hour in which it is spoken.

After a long history of prophetism in which the legitimation of the prophet was the spirit which moved him (very visibly) and the prophetic tradition in which he stood and which gave him his trademarks such as ecstasy,

---

[1] Jeremiah 29:9,31. Cf. Hänel, op. cit., p. 199.

[2] Jeremiah 28:8f.

Jeremiah finally eliminated this legitimation and demanded that all proclamations of any prophet be spoken in and for a particular hour of history. Yahwe is a god of history and he will watch over his dabar; this is the conviction of Jeremiah. If a prophet is a messenger of Yahwe, he will be proven right by the events of history.

If a prophet is a messenger of Yahwe he will speak the truth; if he is not he is a liar, says Jeremiah. Does a nabi concede to the nebiim that they see the truth? The nebiim are under the influence of alcohol when they have their visions[1] and Yahwe closed their eyes so that they cannot see.[2] The people do not want the seers to proclaim the truth.[3] The nabi does not deny that the nebiim have visions, but they combat these visions and their content.[4] Their visions are not truth, but are inventions of the heart, lies. The oracles of the nebiim are used as a human possibility to achieve an answer from Yahwe. They are related to the priestly form of oracle, where an alternative question is asked.[5] The nebiim are related to the cult. As we have discussed above, they were located at cult centers and also employed the priestly form of oracle,

---

[1] Isaiah 28:7.

[2] Isaiah 29:10.

[3] Isaiah 30:10.

[4] Jeremiah 14:14; 23:16; Ezekiel 12:24; 13:6ff.; 21:34, etc.

[5] 1 Kings 22:6.

which offers the alternative: shall I or shall I not?[1]

The message of the nebiim and the question about the truth of the prophetic message has to be considered against the background of the cult. It is true that the nabi basically is a prophet of doom and the nebiim basically are proclaimers of salvation. Usually one makes the distinction between nabi and nebiim as between "true" and "false" prophets. The question of whose message is true, however, is more complicated than it seems. Our thesis is that both spoke the truth, nabi and nebiim. The nabi spoke the truth as it was revealed to him through a dabar of Yahwe, and the nebiim spoke the truth as the cult proclaimed it. Outside the cult there was no message of salvation as the nebiim proclaimed it.

The bitter fight between nabi and nebiim can only be understood against this background. The original free inspiration of all prophets had been institutionalized, as we emphasized above, through the establishment of prophetic "schools". The prophet as a tool of Yahwe became an instrument of the cult through offering his service as a receiver of oracles. Thus the cult could boast the employment of both forms of divine revelation, the technical priestly form of inquiry and the "free" charismatic form of inquiry.[2]

---

[1] 1 Kings 22:6.

[2] See 1 Kings 22:6ff., where we find the optimum: not only are the professionals employed but the possibility of inquiring of a non-professional is taken advantage of. The non-professional stands in opposition of the message of

The truth of the *nabi* is the free-moving independent *dabar* of Yahwe. The truth of the *nebiim* is the security of salvation which the cult offers. The *nebiim* can claim the authority of the cult behind them. Truth stands against truth. On one side the "unauthorized" truth of the *nabi*; on the other side the truth of the *nebiim*, which is authorized by the cult.[1] History will prove the truth of of Jeremiah's message and the lie of the *nebiim*. The criterion of history for the truth of a prophetic message is foreign to the cult, and foreign to its purpose of catching the spontaneous, limiting the unlimited, and instituting the *charisma* to employ it in regulated form.

---

salvation as the four hundred proclaim it. They create victory for Ahab, king of Israel, therefore the king does not want to hear the message of Micaiah when he knows its content. The four hundred fulfill a function of the cult when they create victory by assuring the king of the assistance of Yahwe. As it is the function of the cult to create salvation, thus it is the function of the *nebiim* to make this salvation relevant to the historical situation.

[1] How truth can be so different a reality for two different people reminds one of a modern parallel. A communist and a non-communist discuss freedom in East and West. The communist claims total freedom as existing only in his country and the man from the West denies that there is freedom in communist countries, claiming freedom for his own country. They both are right. For the communist freedom is communist freedom. He understands freedom as one of the goals of communist society. For the man from the West, freedom is an exclusive western quality, and that which is proclaimed as freedom by the communist he understands as the very opposite of freedom. East and West use the same term without communicating to one another. *Nabi* and *nebiim* both deliver messages of Yahwe. They both say "thus speaks Yahwe". Still, one of them has to be wrong, as much as freedom can be only one thing. Or to switch back to the encounter of Ahaz and Isaiah in Isaiah 7:9-12,

History should pronounce that the nabi was right and that his message was true. Deuteronomy judged on the basis of the historical events that the nebiim were wrong, but adopted the message of salvation in a modified form. Post-exilic religion in Israel was a non-cultic religion. The cult died with the monarchy. But the cult left one important idea: the expectation of a messianic king from the house of David. The prophetic-Emmanuel Messiah blended with the Davidic figure.[1]

Isaiah calls for a reality (the holy war) with which Ahaz is not familiar. He does not know it, therefore he cannot ask the sign which Isaiah encourages him to ask. For Ahaz, war is something for warriors and strategists. There is a time for the cult to prepare for war and create victory for the king. From then on it is the matter of military and strategic ability for king and army which decides the war.

[1] Cf. the section below on Deutero-Isaiah.

The Legitimation of the Nabi

As a result of the preceding discussion, we have to conclude that for the time in which they lived, the "great" prophets had no way of legitimating themselves in distinction to their adversaries. Ecstasy, visions, and "thus speaks Yahwe" were trademarks common to all prophets. They could not be a means of distinguishing. For us the situation looks different. But for us the "great" prophets do not have to legitimate themselves. We know about the outcome of history and of the truth of the message of doom. We know the true source of the prophetic dabar and have a negative judgment of the mantic methods of the nebiim. For us the nabi, by virtue of his charisma, is the only authorized mediator between people and Yahwe.[1] It is a long way from the "man of God", seer, prophet, and priest Samuel, from charismatic magicians[2] and the possessors of superhuman knowledge and strength[3] to the nabis of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.

The nabis of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. understand themselves as isolated and separated from the sacred institutions of their time.[4] They felt themselves

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 106.

[2] 1 Kings 17:21; 2 Kings 4:34; 13:21; 2 Kings 2:8; 14; 4:29. Cf. also Hempel, Gott und Mensch..., p. 125.

[3] 2 Kings 5:26; 6:32; 1 Kings 18:46.

[4] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 106.

authorized by a personal charisma in their fight against sacred institutions. Not that they denied basically the legitimacy of monarchy, priesthood, or the legal office of the elders, but they based their opposition on an entirely different understanding of these offices.[1] Priests, prophets, and kings misused their offices in the eyes of the nabi. Priests, prophets, and kings understood their offices on the background of the cult, which was preaching salvation and "peace, peace".

To discover the legitimacy of the nabi we shall discuss the authority of a prophet of Yahwe as he himself understood it. The nabi understood himself as a messenger of Yahwe, an ebed of Yahwe and as the receiver of the dabar of Yahwe.

The nabi is a messenger of Yahwe. When a nabi denied that the nebiim were sent by Yahwe, he maintained at the same time that he himself was a true messenger of Yahwe. The important moment is when Yahwe takes the initiative and calls a prophet out of his previous environment to use him as a messenger. This is particularly clear in the case of Amos, who was a shepherd and did not feel any connection with a prophet or with prophetic circles.[2] How much the call of Yahwe was a burden for Jeremiah is

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 106.

[2] Amos 1:1; 7:14.

attested all through the book of Jeremiah. Yahwe overpowered him and left him no choice. Jeremiah is made the mouthpiece of Yahwe,[1] and even if Jeremiah wants to, he cannot hold back the word which Yahwe wants to say through him.[2] The word of the Lord is like a hammer that breaks the rock.[3]

Yahwe has sent the prophets;[4] he has put his word in the mouth of his prophet by touching his lips, thus preparing true delivery.[5] The nabi is to speak what Yahwe commands him.[6] With Yahwe's assistance the nabi delivers his message.[7] The prophet speaks and opens his message with "thus speaks Yahwe".[8] When Baruch reads out of the scroll in the temple, in one verse the words are the words of Jeremiah and in another the words of Yahwe. The necessity of legitimating his message Jeremiah demands only of a "false" prophet. Those who say "peace" can be proven to be truly sent by Yahwe only when the word of their

---

[1] Jeremiah 15:19.

[2] Jeremiah 4:19; 20:7; 23:9.

[3] Jeremiah 23:29.

[4] Jeremiah 7:25; 26:12,15.

[5] Jeremiah 1:9; Isaiah 6:7.

[6] Jeremiah 1:7.

[7] Jeremiah 1:8.

[8] Ezekiel 2:4; Jeremiah 27:16; 38:17; 45:1; Zechariah 1:4.

message is fulfilled.[1] In contrast to the *nebiim*, the *nabi* knows (ידע) the will of Yahwe. To proclaim this will to the people is the main task of the prophet.[2]

The nabi is an ebed of Yahwe. A title closely connected with that of messenger is *ebed*. Ahiah of Shiloh, Elijah, and Isaiah are called servants of Yahwe.[3] The only time a prophet calls himself a servant of Yahwe is in Elijah's prayer on Mount Carmel.[4] Usually Yahwe himself refers to the prophets as his servants.[5] Like the title "messenger", the title *ebed* designated a task allotted the prophets, by Yahwe. Like the messenger of Yahwe, the *ebed* of Yahwe is identified with his master.

As Yahwe's mouthpiece, his servants, they are tabu.[6] To attack his servant meant to attack Yahwe himself, and Yahwe avenges the blood of his servant.[7] At the struggle between the prophets of Baal and Elijah on Mount Carmel, Elijah acts as a servant of Yahwe and proves this

---

[1] Jeremiah 28:9.

[2] Isaiah 5:19; 33:13; Jeremiah 5:5; 9:23; 31:34; Ezekiel 36:32; Hosea 4:6; 8:2; 13:4; Joel 2:14; Malachi 2:7.

[3] 1 Kings 14:18; 15:29; 18:36; 2 Kings 9:36; 10:10; Isaiah 20:3.

[4] 1 Kings 18:36. Cf. Lindhagen, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

[5] 1 Kings 9:7; Jeremiah 26:5; 29:19; Ezekiel 38:17; Jeremiah 7:25; 35:15; 44:4; Isaiah 20:3; Amos 3:7, etc.

[6] This may be indicated by a mark they wore at the forehead. See 1 Kings 20:38ff.; Ezekiel 9:4; Isaiah 44:5, and Lindhagen, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

[7] 2 Kings 9:7.

when Yahwe shows himself God and Elijah his servant.[1]

Through the title *ebed* a prophet is separated from his people as a whole. He stands in a particular relationship to Yahwe. Yahwe is his master and he is the servant with a task directed towards the people.[2] Above we discussed the term עבדה as denoting the cultic service of the priests. The title עבד as used for the *nabi*, however, seems to have been lifted out of the cultic sphere. The prophet is not called a servant because he fulfills his cultic duties, but because he serves as a tool of Yahwe in proclaiming Yahwe's purpose in the events of history.

The nabi is the receiver of the dabar of Yahwe. As a servant the *nabi* is sent to proclaim the *dabar* which Yahwe has revealed to him. The *nabi* claims his authority on the basis of this *dabar*. The *dabar* is the "weapon" of the *nabi* and his only and true motif. Already the way in which the texts which speak about a *dabar* of Yahwe are distributed over the Old Testament shows the close relationship between prophet and *dabar* of Yahwe. The *prophetae priores* present the phrase "dabar Yahwe" 64 times, and 62 of these texts are found in Samuel and Kings. Five-eighths of all "dabar Yahwe" texts are found in the *prophetae posteriores*.[3] When we consider the books which

---

[1] 1 Kings 18:36.

[2] Jeremiah 23:18,22; 2 Kings 22:19-22.

[3] Otto Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1943), p. 66. All together

describe the prophetic time and the writings of the prophets themselves together we find that ninety-three per cent of all "dabar Yahwe" texts are found here. Dabar, we may conclude, is a technical term for prophetic revelation.

Following the outline of Grether, we suggest five groups of texts in which dabar is sometimes the word of Yahwe to the prophet, sometimes the dabar which the prophet addresses to his countrymen, and sometimes the prophetic "dabar Yahwe". For the nabi, only the one who had received a dabar could legitimately proclaim it. Therefore all the above-mentioned variations of the dabar mean one dabar and we do not have to distinguish between the dabar of the prophet and the dabar of Yahwe. The first group present all those texts in which "dabar Yahwe" is connected with היה and אל־.[1] The second group presents the "dabar Yahwe" as proclaimed by a prophet.[2] The third group speaks about the "dabar Yahwe" as accusative with imperative of the verb שמע.[3] In the fourth group the context shows that "dabar Yahwe" is the prophetic word.[4] The "dabar Yahwe" comes to different

---

the phrase "dabar Yahwe" is presented 241 times: in Joshua and Judges twice, in Ketubim 19 times, twice in Psalms, once in Daniel and Ezra, and 15 times in the Chronistic history.

[1] Isaiah 38:4 and 2 Kings 20:4; Jeremiah 1:2,4,11,13; 2:1; 13:3,8; 14:1; 16:1; 18:5; 24:4; 25:3; 28:12; 29:30; 32:6,26; 33:1,19,23; 34:12; 35:12; 36:27; 37:6; 39:15; 42:7; 43:8; 46:1; 47:34; Daniel 9:2; Hosea 1:1; Ezekiel 50 times.

[2] For example, Isaiah 39:8 and 2 Kings 20:19.

[3] Grether, op. cit., p. 69.

[4] 1 Samuel 3:1; 3:21; 15:13; 1 Kings 13:1ff.; 13:26,etc.

recognize the [illegible]

[illegible] themselves [illegible]

the end of all things [illegible]

[illegible], we may [illegible]

Following the [illegible]

[illegible] which [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

and received [illegible]

Therefore all but s v-called [illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible] and we do [illegible]

the glory of the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

men, and becomes active in the personal history of these men and in the history of the people. That is the fifth group.[1]

The Hebrew word דבר has the same quality which the Latin word res has. It can mean both "word", and "thing". This double meaning was an advantage to the prophetic dabar. The "dabar Yahwe" as the prophets proclaimed it bore in itself not only the proclamation but also the realization of the proclaimed "thing". This possibly may be one of the reasons why the prophets preferred the term דבר to designate the form of revelation peculiar to them. The double character of דבר gave it a superiority over other forms of revelation. It owned an intensity and quality which other forms of revelation did not have.

Dabar frequently was combined with forms of "sensing" which we normally do not have in mind when we speak of "word". Dabar and dream or vision are not opposites. A dabar sometimes is communicated through a dream or a vision.[2] Häussermann concludes that originally the reception of a dabar always had a visionary character.[3] Amos 7:8 has חזה connected with an undepicted object. Häussermann uses this text as proof of his thesis. However, not only the

---

[1] Judges 3:20; 2 Samuel 16:23; 1 Kings 16:34; 13:18, etc.

[2] 1 Samuel 3:10; 15:11f.; 2 Samuel 7:4; Nathan receives his dabar during the night; Isaiah 28:7f. Cf. Ploger, ZAW, LXIII (1951), p. 182.

[3] Friedrich Häussermann, Wortempfang und Symbol in der Alttestamentlichen Prophetie," (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1932), p. 72.

early prophets may have received a dabar in the form of a vision, for later prophets also knew this form of revelation.[1] In the realm of vision belongs also the peculiar figure of the "watchman".[2] That which the watchman sees is characterized as sent by Yahwe. Is this watchman a personification of an inner event in the prophet?[3] Is he an organ of the soul through which the prophet is able to see visions? Duhm thinks that the watchman is a second ego separated from the prophet's ego.[4] The watchman always is connected closely with the person of the prophet.[5] We do not know what the figure of the watchman stands for. Possibly it is a dialogical means of the nabi.

A revelation of Yahwe frequently is introduced by the question, "what do you see?"[6] What is the purpose of this question? Does it open the conversation between prophet and Yahwe in the form of a vision? Here also belongs the opening of a prophetic vision through an

---

[1] Besides Amos 7:2,4,7ff.; 8:1; 9:1 see Isaiah 6:1ff.; 18:4; Jeremiah 1:9,11,13; 24:1,2; 38:22.

[2] Isaiah 21:6-10.

[3] Hänel, op. cit., p. 92.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Isaiah 21:11,12; Jeremiah 6:17; Ezekiel 3:17; 33:2,6,7; Micah 7:4; Habbakuk 2:1.

[6] Amos 7:8; Jeremiah 1:11ff.; 24:1ff.

interjection הנה.[1] Jeremiah accuses the "false" prophets of visions which are not out of the mouth of Yahwe.[2] Another incident where a vision is called a *dabar* which Yahwe has let the prophet see is in Jeremiah 38:21.

The "dabar Yahwe" 'happens' to the *nabi*.[3] This verb 'happens' (היה) signifies the abruptness and suddenness with which a *dabar* comes to a prophet. It also indicates clearly that the *dabar* is not something which the prophet creates out of himself. Never does a *dabar* 'happen' to one of the *nebiim*. The *dabar* comes out of a sphere other than the human. Towards the end of prophetism in Israel skepticism appears in the valuation of vision and dreams as a means of revelation. Jeremiah combats visions and dreams as a means of revelation for his enemies.[4] The relationship of dream and *dabar* is like straw and wheat.[5]

A clear pronouncement against dream and vision even Jeremiah did not make. For him, however, they were not things upon which he would build his legitimation as a prophet of Yahwe. Yahwe's *dabar* is to be preferred to all dreams and visions. Jeremiah secured the unconditional

---

[1] Jeremiah 4:13,16; Isaiah 30:27; Amos 7:1,4,7; 8:1; Ezekiel 1:4; 8:2; Jeremiah 4:23ff.

[2] Jeremiah 23:16.

[3] Jeremiah 1:1; 11:1 etc.; Hosea 1:1; Joel 1:1; Jonah 1:1.

[4] Jeremiah 23:16,25,31.

[5] Jeremiah 23:28.

transcendence of revelation.[1] Thus at least some distinction could be made between him and the nebiim. Jeremiah is related in his skepticism to Amos. For Amos also, visions are not the important thing. He resists the will of Yahwe in praying for Israel as long as he has "only" visions. When the dabar'happens' to him the will of Yahwe becomes final for him and he proclaims.[2]

Visions are completely missing in Hosea, Micah, Zephaniah, and Nahum. We know one very important vision in the life of Isaiah.[3] The more visions and dreams disappear into the background in the writings of the prophets, the more the role of dabar is emphasized.[4]

The passage of Isaiah 9:8 is remarkable. Here the dabar is used for the first time without particular content. Dabar here is the carrier of a power. Therefore the dabar is not connected with any "hearing" or "seeing". The prophet completely stepped into the background. He is not even considered the mediator. He only witnesses the sending of the dabar. The dynamis which dwells in the "dabar Yahwe" is emphasized most in Jeremiah.[5] He only needs to pronounce

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie,.., p. 118.

[2] Amos 7:1ff.; 8:1ff.; 9:1ff.; cf. especially 3:8; 7:14.

[3] Isaiah 6.

[4] Grether, op. cit., p. 91.

[5] Jeremiah 1:9ff.

the dabar and it will be active; it uproots and pulls down, wrecks and ruins. Yahwe guarantees the efficiency of his dabar. He stands behind or is active in his dabar. He watches over it.[1] The dynamis of the dabar does not stop before him who proclaims it. It overcomes him who resists it.[2]

Yahwe remains hidden when he speaks his dabar. His presence is assumed when he reveals himself in a dream,[3] or in a vision,[4] but he is not visible to the human eye. Like the dabar, dream and vision are not visible except to faith. In spite of the clarity of the dabar and its meaning, the mystery of revelation is not lifted. Revelations are always an act of Yahwe; no one can force Yahwe to reveal himself. A dabar is granted freely and cannot be achieved by mantic means and methods. In the struggle with Hananiah, Jeremiah had no dabar available. Once he had to wait ten days until Yahwe sent his dabar.[5] Sometimes a dabar is rare,[6] and sometimes it stays away entirely.[7]

---

[1] Jeremiah 5:14; 23:29.

[2] Jeremiah 20:7ff.; Amos 3:8.

[3] Genesis 20:3; 31:24.

[4] Isaiah 6:1.

[5] Jeremiah 42:7.

[6] 1 Samuel 3:1.

[7] Amos 8:11f.; Micah 3:7.

The development of a theology of the dabar in Deuteronomy's theology began with the passage cited above in Isaiah.[1] A hypostatization of the dabar can be recognized in Jeremiah.[2] The dabar proclaimed by the prophet has its own existence separated from Yahwe. It takes the place of Yahwe. Not Yahwe is like a hammer breaking rocks, but the dabar is.[3] The dabar of Yahwe had an independent existence. The more the dabar is considered the guiding principle of history, the greater independence it achieves, until it finally assumes the position of Yahwe's messenger and representative.[4]

It has been said that the reception of a dabar so far as it is psychologically conceivable happens in a dimension of the life of the soul, of the subconscious.[5] This is only an inadequate description of the influence which Yahwe exercises over the nabi. This influence certainly penetrates the whole person of the nabi and is not confined to the soul or the subconscious. Psychological attempts to explain the realm where man and God meet and man is influenced by God are in vain. Just because the whole person

---

[1] Isaiah 9:8. Cf. also Grether, op. cit., p. 152.

[2] Jeremiah 5:14; 20:8f.; 23:29; 15:16.

[3] Jeremiah 23:29.

[4] Grether, op. cit., p. 154. Cf. Isaiah 55:10ff.; 40:8; Jeremiah 39:16; 33:14; Zechariah 1:6.

[5] Häussermann, op. cit., p. 126.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

is affected, any explanation is made impossible. The whole person is involved but only the results of the encounter are visible, and not the encounter itself.

Phenomenology stops before revelation, because that which reveals itself does not show itself. This is not so remarkable. "The 'showing himself' of Yahwe has to be something different from the 'showing itself' of the phenomenon".[1] The event of revelation is hidden from our eyes. It is the characteristic of revelation that that which cannot be known in any other way reveals itself. Through revelation it does not cease to be hidden, because hiddenness is its essence.[2]

Revelation is an action of Yahwe; only he to whom something happened for Yahwe's sake can speak about him. To explain the "revelation" to the _nabi_, which is the receiving of a "dabar Yahwe", we have to remind ourselves that the _dabar_ has a goal, that means has a self-purpose. The prophetic _dabar_ has its goal in history, more precisely in one event of history. The _nabi_ is looking for a point, the center of this event, from which he is able to "understand" the meaning of this particular event. It is difficult for man to look at something in which he himself very much belongs, because man is not able to think beyond himself, in effect, any experience of [illegible]. [illegible] person is involved but [illegible] our results in the [illegible] are visible, and nothing [illegible] itself.

---

[1] Van der Leeuw, _op_. _cit_., p. 640 (my translation).

[2] _Ibid_.

[illegible] which reveals [illegible] itself. [illegible] readiness. [illegible] something different from the 'absolute itself' of the [illegible] moment.) The event of [illegible] It is the [illegible] of [illegible] cannot be known in any other way [illegible]. [illegible] revelation it does not [illegible], because [illegible] come to its essence.[1]

Revelation is an [illegible] something [illegible] the "revelation" to [illegible], which [illegible] that the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] the essence of this [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of this [illegible] [illegible] belong, because [illegible], unless it is in faith. The meaning and purpose or the center of an event does not reveal itself to the *nabi*; Yahwe reveals to him the center. He, Yahwe himself, is the center of every historical event in which he comes to or against his people for salvation or for doom.

---

[1] [illegible]

Finally, we have to say something about the relationship between *torah* and *dabar*. The word *dabar* was not only used for the prophetic revelation of Yahwe, but also for "legal" revelation of Yahwe. A terminological difference is made between the two forms of revelation in so far as the plural *debarim* is used to denote *torah*, while *dabar*, as discussed above, denotes prophetic revelation. Another difference is that *debarim* have a continued validity while the prophetic *dabar* is related to one particular historical situation. The prophetic *dabar* demands an ever renewed revelation of Yahwe. If Yahwe does not speak, the *dabar* will cease. Already the prophets announced the ceasing of the "dabar Yahwe" as punishment.[1]

The time came when no prophetic *dabar* was spoken any longer. What remained were *debarim*, the *torah*, the will of Yahwe manifested in the Decalogue. *Torah* was the basis of the prophetic proclamation when the prophets demanded obedience instead of sacrifices.[2] One may say that *torah* is the revelation of Yahwe in and through tradition,

---

[1] Amos 8:11; Micah 3:7; Jeremiah 18:18; Isaiah 28:13.

[2] Jeremiah 7;21ff.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

while *dabar* is revelation of Yahwe *in actu*. Deuteronomy makes Moses a prophet and thus combines the two forms of revelation in one person. Deuteronomy also claims that the *dabar* will continue to guide history. This means the continuation of prophets is not allowed to cease. Yahwe will again and again awake a prophet, thus guaranteeing the continuous presence of the *dabar* to guide history.[1]

The *nabi* feels responsible for the exercise and proclamation of the *torah* of Yahwe. Hosea accuses the priests of forgetting *torah*.[2] Because the priests have forgotten to teach *torah* the people have no knowledge of Yahwe; therefore there is no fidelity in the land,[3] and the people curse, murder, steal, and commit adultery.[4] It is the task of the priests to present authentic *torah*. Zephaniah depicts priests as profaning holy things and violating torah.[5] The same accusation is expressed in Ezekiel.[6] The priests make no distinction between holy and profane. They close their eyes before the demands of *torah*. The priests do not even care for Yahwe.[7] They are

---

[1] Deuteronomy 18:15,18.

[2] Hosea 4:6.

[3] Hosea 4:1.

[4] Hosea 4:2.

[5] Zephaniah 3:4.

[6] Ezekiel 22:26.

[7] Jeremiah 2:8.

guilty because the people do not know the ordinance of Yahwe, although the priests claim to know the law and have Yahwe with them.[1]

The full demand of the prophets and what they expected the priests to do is represented in Malachi.[2] The priests have violated the covenant which Yahwe made with Levi. In the beginning they taught torah and turned many away from guilt. The priest should be a messenger of Yahwe but he defected and made many stumble because he polluted instruction (torah). Isaiah seems to understand as one of the responsibilities of the nabi the imparting of torah.[3] Isaiah assumed this responsibility because the priests were false teachers as much as were the nebiim.[4]

---

[1] Jeremiah 8:8.

[2] Malachi 2:4-9.

[3] Isaiah 1:10; cf. Östborn, op. cit., p. 128.

[4] Isaiah 9:14. Here the nebiim are the same as in 28:7, where they are named together with the priests.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Prophet and Tradition

The nabi became the champion in the fight against everything which was alien to Israel.[1] He stood firmly in a tradition which guarded and re-activated the old "achievements" and conditions of Israel's amphictyonic existence. It is true that the nabi belonged to the nebiim in so far as he showed many of the characteristics of the nebiim. This is particularly true for the beginning of prophetism in Israel. Later these similarities vanish more and more, together with the emphasis of the nabi that he has nothing to do with the nebiim. The main difference was - as we have seen - the content of the prophetic message and the claim of the nabi to be the receiver of a true dabar of Yahwe, while the nebiim proclaimed the inventions of their own hearts or were gifted with a lying-spirit by Yahwe.

The question we now face is, where is the origin of the content of the nabi's message? Earlier we have described the prophetic dabar as revelation. In other words, Yahwe is the origin of a nabi's message. It is impossible to penetrate the phenomenon of revelation.[2] It seems strange that that which reveals itself does not show itself. However, in reality this is not so strange. Only that which

---

[1] Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 132.

[2] Van der Leeuw, op. cit., p. 640.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

in no other way is approachable reveals itself. That which essentially is hidden will be revealed. Yahwe reveals himself because hiddenness is his essence. Revelation therefore is an action of Yahwe. Only the one to whom Yahwe spoke can speak. Revelation does not happen in a vacuum; it demands an object, a bearer. A nabi is such a bearer. He experienced the revelation of Yahwe, which cannot be described in its essence.

The nabi also stands in a tradition and he has to live in this tradition. Therefore he has to speak in and through it, because only so can he communicate what he experienced. He experienced revelation, which is a phenomenon, in the center of which is Yahwe. The nabi communicates essentially nothing but the center, but he does this in his time and life, which are determined by past, present, and future. Present and future provide the color or emphasis; the past forms the frame and Yahwe is the content of a prophet's message. We are here concerned with the past or with tradition.

Standing in the old amphictyonic traditions, the nabi judges Israel on the basis of these traditions. The result was that the nabi resented the whole life of the Israelite community, the Canaanized cult, the social organization in its relationship to the covenant.[1] We find

---

[1] Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 134.

opposition to the luxury of city life.[1] Into this line also belongs the prophetic appreciation of the groups and brotherhoods of the Rechabites and Nazirites.

The Rechabites derived themselves from Jonadab ben Rechab.[2] They observed certain customs such as no drinking of wine, and living in tents instead of houses. They lived a nomadic life and did not sow or plant vineyards,[3] which implies that they lived from herds. We know from Leviticus 10:8ff that there was a commandment of Yahwe prohibiting the drinking of wine.[4] The Rechabites apparently lived in a tribal group.[5] According to 1 Chronicles 2:55, they stood in genealogical connection with the Cenites, living like them a half-nomadic existence.[6] Amos considers the Nazirites a sign from Yahwe, reminding the people of Yahwe's presence.[7]

We find very few references in the pre-exilic prophets to the patriarchal traditions. Amos mentions

---

[1] Isaiah 5:4; Jeremiah 22:14; Amos 3:15; 5:11; 6:4.

[2] Jeremiah 35:2ff.

[3] Jeremiah 35:6ff.

[4] Ostborn, _op_. _cit_., p. 135.

[5] Jeremiah 35:6ff.

[6] Judges 4:11; 1 Samuel 15:6; 30:29.

[7] Amos 2:11ff. For the ritual prescriptions of a temporary Nazirite see Numbers 6:1ff.

Isaac,[1] Jacob,[2] and Joseph.[3] Besides these mentions of the fathers, we find some remarks about Sodom and Gomorrah.[4] Hosea uses the comparison of Israel-Ephraim-Judah to the ancestor Jacob to illustrate the life of the people as compared to the life of the ancestor Jacob,[5] who "in the womb... seized his brother's heel, and in his manhood strove with God."[6] Isaiah has only a few references to the past. He mentions Sodom and Gomorrah.[7] The appearance of "who redeemed Abraham" in Isaiah 29:22 is textually suspect.[8] After the exile, references to the fathers become more frequent. Ezekiel refers to the land which Yahwe gave to his servant Jacob.[9]

The prophets did not mean to be reformers. They meant to preserve the traditions in their original impact upon the life of Israel. As the mouth of Yahwe, they accuse

---

[1] Amos 7:9,16.

[2] Amos 3:13; 6:8; 7:2,5; 8:7.

[3] Amos 5:6,15; 6:6. Cf. Christopher R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History (London: Epworth Press, 1946), p. 42.

[4] Amos 4:11, Hosea 11:8, where the names are rendered Admah and Zeboim. Cf. North, op. cit., p. 42.

[5] Hosea 11:12-12:6.

[6] Hosea 12:3.

[7] Isaiah 1:9f.; 3:9.

[8] North, op. cit., p. 42.

[9] Ezekiel 28:25; cf. also 37:25; 33:24.

the people of their violations against the relationship to Yahwe.[1] The people have violated the covenant; the kings have abandoned the holy war and assumed a position which is not suited to a servant of Yahwe. Yahwe is the king of Israel and the kings in Jerusalem and Samaria are "only" officials of Yahwe. The nabi looks back to the time in the wilderness, when the people lived as nomads, as an ideal. It was a time without Canaanization of worship and leadership, and the people were faithful to Yahwe.

We shall proceed discussing the covenant, holy war, Mosaic time as ideal, and the kingship of Yahwe as the main strata of tradition underlying the message of the nabi.

Prophet and covenant. To understand the words of the prophets about the faithlessness of the people, we have to keep in mind the form of covenant which we know from the royal festivals in Jerusalem. The covenantal relationship was here polluted into an unbreakable natural relationship between Yahwe and his people. The royal cult understood covenant as something which could be renewed ever and ever again through right and legitimate cultic actions. This type of covenant is called an everlasting covenant. As we have seen, David and his house were the recipients of an everlasting covenant with Yahwe. For the Jerusalem cult and probably also for popular Yahwism

---

[1] Ernst Würthwein, "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede," ZTK, 1952, p. 9.

in Judah, which was determined by the cultic interpretation of the covenant, any ceasing of the covenantal relationship between Yahwe and his people was unthinkable.[1]

This feeling of security in virtue of the everlasting covenantal relationship between Yahwe and the house of David was severely attacked by the prophets. Jeremiah assails the security which results from right celebration of rituals and making of sacrifices.[2] Foreign deities are not mentioned in Jeremiah 6:16-21, therefore we have to assume that Jeremiah directs his accusation against the syncretistic Yahwe cult in Jerusalem. The people sacrificed but did not listen to the "words" and instructions of Yahwe. Yahwe does not care for frankincense from Sheba; he demands faithfulness.[3] The precious gifts cannot disguise disobedience against the will of Yahwe. The people knew the will of Yahwe through "words", instructions, and through past history.[4] The people

> steal, murder, and commit adultery, swear falsely, offer sacrifices to the Baal, and run after other gods, whom you do not know, and then come and stand before me in this house which bears my name, and say, "We are safe" - only to practice all these abominations.[5]

---

[1] Hentschke, op. cit., p. 110.

[2] Jeremiah 6:16-21.

[3] Jeremiah 6:20.

[4] Jeremiah 6:16.

[5] Jeremiah 7:9-10.

In the preceding passage the violation of the covenantal bonds between Yahwe and the people is followed by the prophecy of the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. Yahwe shall do to the temple what he did with his house at Shiloh. The fact that Yahwe has established his name in those places did not mean that they were safe from his anger.[1] Fasting and offerings Yahwe will not accept. He will instead consume the people with sword, famine, and pestilence, in spite of the _nebiim_ who proclaim the opposite. _Nebiim_ are lying; they preach empty superstitions and deceptive inventions of their own minds.[2]

Yahwe brought Israel up out of Egypt and made a covenant with her. But the people misused this covenantal relationship. They relied blindly upon Yahwe's protection and did not think of the obligation which resulted from the relationship with Yahwe. They should seek the good and not the evil. Then Yahwe Sabaoth would be with them.[3] Instead, they loved evil and relied on the cult, saying "disaster shall not overtake us".[4] Just because of the covenant and the closeness between Yahwe and his people, Israel was

---

[1] Cf. also Jeremiah 26:4ff.: the reference to Shiloh is combined here with the law of Yahwe which they did not follow, and the words of the prophets to which the people did not listen. To the temple in Jerusalem the same will happen which happened to Shiloh.

[2] Jeremiah 14:12ff.

[3] Amos 5:14.

[4] Amos 9:10.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

in greater danger: "You only have I known of all families of the earth; therefore will I punish you for all your wrong-doing."[1] They cry "my God, we, Israel, know thee". But this will do them no good, for they have broken the covenant and sinned against the covenantal torah.[2]

Nebiim and priests have established the security of the people,[3] but this will not save them from the wrath of Yahwe. Isaiah, in blasting irony, destroys the argument of invulnerability of the relationship between Yahwe and Judah with which the "rulers" in Jerusalem countered his attack.[4] They rely on alliance with Egypt ("Death" and "Sheol") and are confident that the threat will not reach them. But the alliance is a "refuge of lies" and will be in vain.

Jeremiah reminds the people of the day of the exodus when Yahwe made a covenant between himself and their forefathers: (Ch. 11, vv.3ff.) "Listen to my voice, and do just as I command you. So shall you be my people, and I will be your God" (v.4). Because the people did not listen to the voice of Yahwe and followed their own stubbornness, Yahwe brought upon them "all threats of this covenant".(v.8).

---

[1] Amos 3:2.

[2] Hosea 8:1ff. and 6:7.

[3] Micah 3:11.

[4] Isaiah 28:12-22.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

This verse clearly states the character of the covenant. The covenant was salvation when the people would listen, but it was threat when they did not obey. This second, negative side of the covenant was foreign to the cult.[1]

In Hosea we find the picture of husband and wife used for the relationship between Yahwe and Israel.[2] The husband-wife relationship between Yahwe and Israel seems to be a historization of the divine marriage.[3] The election of Israel through Yahwe frequently is expressed in verbs which can have at least some sexual connotation.[4] Fertility connotations very obviously are present in Hosea 2:19ff.

---

[1] Galling, op. cit., p. 34 , emphasizes the fact that Jeremiah transfers the act of covenanting at Mount Sinai to the beginning of the exodus. Galling would not conclude that Jeremiah does not know the Sinai tradition but that for Jeremiah exodus and covenant belong closely together. It seems, however, that we may go a step further. For Jeremiah Sinai may have been connected with the traditions of Mount Zion. The revelation on Mount Sinai and the covenant concluded there have cultic connotations insofar as the place is a bamah and is a holy place. The text in Exodus 19 has a number of cultic features. Furthermore a bamah must have Baalistic character and therefore be suspicious to a nabi. That Jeremiah connects the covenant with the exodus itself is a true prophetic feature. It is the event in history, the action of Yahwe, which is the beginning of Israel and the beginning of its history with Yahwe. Here among the Egyptians and later in the struggle with other nations Yahwe proved himself to be Israel's god as he had promised in the covenant. Cf. also Galling, op. cit., p. 36: "The covenant of Sinai is emphasized little in our texts compared with the mention of the exodus."(my translation).

[2] Hosea 2:2ff.

[3] Hempel, ZAW, LXV (1953), pp. 116f.

[4] Hosea 11:1: אהב. Hosea avoids this word to denote human love for Yahwe (cf. Hempel, ZAW, LXV (1953), p. 117). Cf. also Amos 3:2: ידע.

Hosea speaks here of an everlasting betrothal (v.19), "in righteousness and justice". However, we cannot assume the same significance for this everlasting betrothal as for the everlasting covenant between Yahwe and the house of David. It is typical for Yahwism that the picture of the husband-wife relationship between Yahwe and Israel is predominantly used in a negative sense. The everlasting betrothal is not unconditional; it lives in righteousness and justice.

Hosea uses the picture to show in marital terms the violation of the relationship between Yahwe and Israel. Israel is a harlot and commits adultery.[1] Therefore Yahwe will make her dry like the desert, and he will have no mercy on the children of the harlot.[2] Hosea speaks of Israel as a cult prostitute. She whores through festivals, new moons, sabbaths, and other fixed festivals.[3]

The people have not kept the covenant and have not acted according to the exclusiveness of their relationship to Yahwe. The prophets understood the great historical catastrophes as the anullment of the covenant by Yahwe.[4] The prophets of the period close to the exile, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah, fought a bitter fight against all efforts to revise the old and against all hopes of

---

[1] Hosea 2:2f.

[2] Hosea 2:4.

[3] Hosea 2:11 and 4:11-16. For the term adultery as a term for non-Israelite cult, see Exodus 34:15f.; Leviticus 17:7; 20:5; Jeremiah 2:20; Ezekiel 16:15, etc.

[4] Hosea 6:7; 8:1; 1:9; Isaiah 2:6; Jeremiah 11:1-3.

revision.[1] They spoke about the new which Yahwe would create, and especially of the new covenant.[2] The new covenant assumes the termination of the old. The events at the end of the Judaic state had proven valid the prophecies of the prophets which were triggered by the violation of the covenantal bond between Yahwe and Israel/Judah.

Mowinckel interprets the new covenant against the background of the throne ascension festival.[3] He considers the new covenant, like the renewal of the covenant at the throne ascension festival, as repetition of the liberation out of Egypt which was connected with the Sinai covenant. In other words the new covenant was just a renewal of the old. Mowinckel's thesis, however, does not take into consideration the witness of the text itself and the character of the prophetic message which tries to overcome the cult. The new covenant will be different from the one Yahwe concluded with the fathers.[4] The new covenant will be concluded with Israel and Judah (this should be the meaning of the mention of Israel and Judah separately); it will establish the old unity.

Yahwe gives his *torah* into the people's breast and writes it in their heart.[5] Thus the old goal is achieved:

---

[1] Von Rad, *Theologie...*, p. 91; cf. also Jeremiah 29.

[2] Jeremiah 31:32; Ezekiel 16:59-63; 37:26-28.

[3] Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II*, p. 202.

[4] Jeremiah 31:32.

[5] Jeremiah 31:33; cf. also 24:7.

Yahwe will be the people's God and the people will be Yahwe's people. There is no necessity any more to teach torah because everyone will know torah and will know Yahwe. We will find the same idea in Ezekiel.[1] Yahwe will give a new heart to the people and put a new spirit within them. The spirit is the teacher of torah, that means Yahwe himself will reveal his will to them in their hearts. The new covenant stands for a new, ever closer relationship of the people to Yahwe. No mention is made of the cult, of sacrifices, or any condition. They are superfluous since the ideal is achieved: the heart of the people belongs to Yahwe and listens to his torah.

If Mowinckel were right in saying that the new covenant is the result of the enthronement festival, Jeremiah hardly would have emphasized the uniqueness of the new covenant as much as he did. It is true sometimes the new possibility reminds us of the situation after the renewal of the cult in the New Years festival; Yahwe will pardon the guilt of the people and will not remember their sin. Jeremiah, however, would then leave the prophetic tradition and would contradict what he had said on other occasions.[2] It is the general tenor of the messages of all major prophets to remind the people of the obligations of the covenant and to keep

---

[1] Ezekiel 37:26; 36:26.

[2] Jeremiah 11:3ff.; 14:9ff.; 7:21ff.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the torah of Yahwe.

The coming historical events, which would destroy the political autonomy of Judah after that of Israel had been destroyed, were interpreted as punishment and anullment of the covenant. Yahwe withdrew from his obligations because the people had forsaken him.[1] This idea is completely foreign to the cult, as we have emphasized repeatedly. Yahwe, however, proved that he was more than a cultic deity, something the prophets had proclaimed all along. That Jeremiah had hit the heart of the cult when he prophesied utter defeat and forsakenness for Judah and Jerusalem, is evidenced by the hatred his enemies showed against him. They plotted against Jeremiah to try to kill him.[2] His enemies certainly were those who turned the covenantal torah into falsehood.[3] How much the new covenant of Jeremiah stood in the old tradition, or rather how much it stood in the Jerusalem tradition or the amphictyonic covenantal tradition, we are able to decide only after having considered the attitude of Deuteronomy towards the covenant.

Concluding, we may say that the prophets attacked a national-religious expectation of salvation,[4] which was

---

[1] Jeremiah 7:15; 11:17; 14:12.

[2] Jeremiah 11:18ff.

[3] Jeremiah 8:8.

[4] Von Rad, ZAW, LXIII (1951), p. 116.

based upon the salvatory theology of the Jerusalem cult. Covenant for the prophets, however, was something which demanded the heart of Israel. Yahwe demanded obedience, not sacrifices and cult practices; the former fostered a positive covenantal theology, but the latter was the motif of the teaching of salvation by the *nabiim*.[1]

The exodus/wilderness period is the ideal. The prophets were judging the faithlessness of their people on the basis of the old covenantal traditions. The liberation from Egypt as the beginning of the relationship between Yahwe and Israel constituted the demand and the right of Yahwe on his people.[2] To popular Yahwism, as represented by the cult in Jerusalem, the fact that Yahwe had chosen Israel out of Egypt meant the guarantee of salvation.[3] Already in the eighth century we meet the proud phrase: Israel is the first of the nations.[4] For Amos the election out of Egypt was nothing to be proud of. Yahwe had elected the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir.[5] "Be prepared to meet your God" is the demand which the election makes of Israel.[6]

---

[1] Von Rad, *ZAW*, LXIII (1951), p. 117.

[2] Cf. also Adam C. Welch, *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1953), p. 19.

[3] Isaiah 8:10; Amos 5:14; Jeremiah 5:12, etc.

[4] Amos 6:1; Numbers 24:20.

[5] Amos 9:7.

[6] Amos 4:12.

Amos reminds his listeners of the constituting event of Israel's existence when he speaks of the exodus and the leading out of Egypt as proof of Yahwe's faithfulness to which the people must respond.[1] The desert time was the place of encounter between people and Yahwe.[2] As for Amos, thus for Hosea also the time in the desert is the ideal. The return into the wilderness is the return to Yahwe.[3] This time was the time of the first love between Yahwe and Israel. When Israel left the desert she forsook Yahwe and whored with Baal. Yahwe will renew the time in the desert. The people again shall live in tents.[4] The first time that we hear about the high esteem of the former time is in the days of Elijah who walks to Mount Horeb in the desert,[5] and when we hear about the Rechabites who preserve the desert way of life.[6]

In the descriptions of the glorious future of Israel, we find phrases which remind us of the exodus. At the end of days Yahwe will demonstrate his leadership in Israel with smoke and flames as he had done when he led Israel out of

---

[1] Amos 2:10f.; 3:2.

[2] Amos 5:25; 2:10.

[3] Hosea 2:14ff.

[4] Hosea 12:9.

[5] 1 Kings 19.

[6] 2 Kings 10:15ff.; Jeremiah 35:6. Cf. also Gressmann, op. cit., p. 184.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Egypt.[1] Smoke and flame are the visible signs with which Yahwe symbolizes his kingship after the judgment and shows his presence on Zion as he had shown his presence among the migrating tribes in the desert.[2] Jeremiah is close to Hosea as he recalls the bridal love which Israel showed in the beginning[3] when she followed Yahwe through the desert.[4] For Jeremiah, as for Amos and Hosea, the events of the exodus are the beginning of Israel's relationship with Yahwe.[5]

Prophet and holy war. When David and Solomon modeled their kingship according to the pattern of the kingships of the surrounding nations, they secularized the military system of Israel. This meant that the foremost function of Yahwe was lost. Yahwe had been the leader of the amphictyonic militia and had protected Israel in the storms of political events. The protection of Israel now was the responsibility of the monarchy. The kings soon changed the military system from a temporary service

---

[1] Isaiah 4:2-6; Exodus 13:21; 40:34-38.

[2] Cf. also Isaiah 24:23, where the flame is substituted by the "glory" of Yahwe himself. Sun and moon are superfluous; Yahwe's כבוד is light. Cf. Exodus 24:9f.

[3] Jeremiah 2:2.

[4] Jeremiah thinks that the desert is mountainous and difficult to pass through. Yahwe was to make even the streets upon which Israel would wander. Cf. Jeremiah 2:6; Isaiah 30:6f.; Deuteronomy 8:15; Numbers 21:4ff.; Isaiah 42:16.

[5] Jeremiah 11:3f.

of the militia to a standing mercenary army, which was more efficient for purposes of modern warfare.

The rise of the kingship coincides with the appearance of prophets. When the charismatic leaders fought the wars for Israel, no nebiim existed.[1] The prophets make themselves speakers for the old traditions, and the holy war, being the main realm of action for Yahwe, occupied their particular interest. When the kings secularized the militia and thus removed Yahwe from the vital sphere of leading and protecting his people, the conflict between prophets and kings began. This conflict continued until the last of the kings had disappeared.

The prophets fought the alliances and the armament policies of the kings. They tried to regain the political realm for the faith of the people through preaching the action of Yahwe precisely in the political realm. The historical events were interpreted as a new encounter with Yahwe. Here Yahwe was active and here he could be found. They demanded obedience and attention to the signs of history; they called for repentence from faithlessness and return to trust in Yahwe as the protector and leader of Israel.

The tradition in 1 Kings 20, which reflects the situation of the ninth century B.C.,[2] still shows some

---

[1] Von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg..., p. 54.

[2] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 105.

cooperation between prophet and king. The king seems to stand in the background while the prophet is the true leader of the army. He commands who shall begin the battle and decides the formation in which to attack.[1] The same story, however, reflects the disruption between prophetism and kingship when an unnamed prophet proclaims a dabar of Yahwe against King Ahab, who had made a covenant with Ben-hadad of Syria instead of destroying him.[2]

This incident reminds us of 1 Samuel 15, where Saul is the victim of a prophetic threat when he violates the law of the holy war, in which all booty belongs to Yahwe. Saul, instead of dedicating the material booty and destroying the prisoners, among them Agag, king of Amalek, spared King Agag and used the lambs, sheep and oxen for his own purposes.[3] Von Rad calls the incident in 1 Samuel 15 a paradigmatic conflict between king and prophet, raised by one of the laws of holy war.[4] In other words, the significance of this tradition is that soon after the rise of kingship the new institution came into conflict with the patriarchal customs of the Yahwe faith.

The tradition of 1 Samuel 15 also knows that Yahwe is stronger. Violation of the will of Yahwe means for the

---

[1] 1 Kings 20:13ff.

[2] 1 Kings 20:42.

[3] 1 Samuel 15:7ff.

[4] Von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg..., p. 41.

king that he loses his kingship. A "better one", who shall inherit the kingship from Saul, rises at the horizon.[1] The pattern of prophetic protest against an unfaithful king begins here and is continued through the history of the northern kingdom. Called as leader in the holy war was the charismatic, the man to whom Yahwe imparted strength and ability, and even more important, the one in whom he was present. Holy wars were Yahwe's wars. He was the true leader. He designated a man to be his representative. The prophet is the mouth of Yahwe. He calls the one who is elected.

After the holy war is dismissed as a strategic-military possibility and the charisma becomes tied to the institution of the anointed, the prophet turns away because Yahwe is turned away. Yahwe has nothing to do with mercenary armies. The kings try to keep prophets as counselors in wars.[2] They still inquire of the prophets and the terminology of the response is that of the holy war.[3] But the leadership of the war did not lie in the hands of a charismatic but with a representative of the institutional monarchy.

From the viewpoint of a king, it was irresponsible

---

[1] 1 Samuel 15:28.

[2] See Ahab and his prophets in 1 Kings 22:5ff. and the opposition of Micaiah, who denounces the efforts of the king.

[3] 1 Kings 22:6b: "Yahwe will deliver it into the hand of the king". Cf. also von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg...,

to make the actions and strategic movements of a war subject to a prophetic _dabar_. For them the protection which a mercenary army in all its efficiency offered to the people naturally was preferable to what happened in holy wars. Possibly the kings were no longer even familiar with what a holy war was. For them prophets were _nebiim_ like those inquired of by Ahab.[1] They were supposed to give favorable response to the inquiry, which means they were supposed to create victory in the king and thus for his army.[2] They may be understood as some sort of army psychologists whose function it was to fill the mind of the king with confidence by means of a _dabar_ of Yahwe.[3] How close together prophet and holy war had grown is evident in the phrase: "My father , my father ! the chariots of Israel and its horsemen!" In 2 Kings 2:12 Elisha is apparently calling Elijah, and in 2 Kings 13:14 Joash calls Elisha with the same phrase.

Adoption of a further characteristic of the holy war is recommended by Isaiah. While the olden time did not know the contrast between the action of Yahwe and the action of men, Isaiah recommends complete passivity in a

---

[1] 1 Kings 22.

[2] Pedersen, _op. cit._, I-II, p. 144.

[3] 2 Kings 2:12; cf. 23:14 also and von Rad, _Theologie..._, p. 105.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] permanently [illegible] included in a [illegible] [illegible]. The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to this [illegible]. Finally the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] from those [illegible]. They [illegible] [illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. They [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and thus the convivial [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

situation of political danger.[1] In the desperate situation during the Syro-Ephraimitic war when Jerusalem was in danger of being conquered by the combined Syrians and Israelites, Isaiah proclaims that Yahwe is the sole possibility of salvation for Jerusalem. Have faith and be quiet[2] is the path which according to Isaiah means survival. He expects a miracle of Yahwe.[3] The people should rely on Yahwe instead of the Egyptians, for the Egyptians are little when compared with Yahwe.[4]

New in Isaiah is the intensification of the idea of the holy war. Yahwe will do it alone. Isaiah's favorite

---

[1] Isaiah 7:1ff.; von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg..., p. 56.

[2] Isaiah 7:9.

[3] Isaiah 30:15: "by returning and resting you shall be saved, in quietness and confidence shall be your strength". See Exodus 14:31, where it is the command of the hour to "see" Yahwe in the hour of danger. Cf. the late passage Isaiah 5:12f. and 22:8b-11.

[4] Cf. Isaiah 31:1-3. The expression that the horses of the Egyptians are flesh and not spirit is strange. What does he mean "not spirit"? Basically בשׂר and רוח reflect the contrast between the sphere of the perishable and mortal and between the sphere of unperishable and immortal. In other words, "flesh" and "spirit" mark the contrast between man and God. Perhaps, however, it is possible to go further in the explanation of this passage.

Von Rad has pointed out the affinity of the passage to the ideas of holy war in Der Heilige Krieg..., p. 61. We know about the importance of charisma for the conduct of a holy war. Charisma is Yahwe as leader, represented in a person of his choice. What verse 3 is saying is that the Judaeans rely on flesh instead of on Yahwe. The Egyptians are not Yahwe. In the same passage, Isaiah recommends the inquiry of the Lord. That means, as we have seen on previous occasions, inquiring of the prophet, in this case Isaiah. He recommends passivity and waiting for the action of Yahwe.

[illegible]

[illegible] of material [illegible] religion. [illegible]

[illegible] Yahweh (Jehovah) [illegible]

[illegible] complete [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

name for Yahwe is "Yahwe Sabaoth".[1] The meaning of the name "Yahwe Sabaoth" is "sustainer of the armies".[2] This name is closely connected with the ark, as we have seen in our discussion of the Levites. Yahwe Sabaoth is Yahwe's title as leader of the amphictyonic militia. Yahwe Sabaoth is the god of the holy war. Other prophets, especially Jeremiah, use this epitheton.[3] Isaiah even saw the eschatological battle in the form of holy war.[4] The invulnerability of Zion is established through the actions of Yahwe in holy war.[5]

---

[1] Isaiah 6:3; 1:9,24,12; 3:1,15; 8:13; 8:18; 9:7; 9:13,19, etc.

[2] Julian Obermann, "The Divine Name YHWH in the Light of Recent Discoveries," JBL LXVIII (1949), p. 310.

[3] Micah 4:4; Zephaniah 2:9; Amos 5:16,17; Hosea 12:6; Jeremiah uses the name 62 times.

[4] Isaiah 5:12,19; 10:12; 17:12ff.; Cf. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg..., p. 62.

[5] Isaiah 30:27ff. This passage usually is counted non-authentic. The question of authenticity however, is irrelevant for the point made.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The Prophetic Interpretation of History

Those men whom we call "great prophets" have in common a unique interpretation of historical event. They felt called by Yahwe to explain the destructive events, which belonged in the framework of the great historical movements of the ancient Near East, as the judgment of Yahwe upon his people Israel. This judgment would mark the end of the relationship between Yahwe and his people. Because the people had not been faithful to the covenantal bonds and had not preserved the exclusiveness of their relationship with Yahwe, the covenant would be anulled.

The prophets interpreted the great historical catastrophes as the anullment of the covenant between Yahwe and Israel.[1] With this proclamation they contradicted the assurance of the cult, which claimed to be able to remove the disturbance of the hour by means of the right cultic action.[2] The cult, however, would not help them in their trouble. What the people did with their gods would now happen to them: Yahwe was to carry them beyond Damascus. There behind the old oppressor of Israel, Syria, the new, more powerful one appeared on the horizon:

---

[1] Hosea 6:7; 8:1; 1:9; Isaiah 2:6; Jeremiah 11:1-3.

[2] Hentschke, op. cit., p. 85.

Assyria.[1]

In this unsurmountable political trouble, Hosea raises his voice, accusing the people of false security. They think that Yahwe will come back like the winter rain after a long drought; he will raise them up after three days and they will live again. The faith of the people is "like a morning cloud, or like the dew that leaves early".[2] The continuity in the cult had assured them of continuity

---

[1] Cf. Amos 5:26-27 and Artur Weiser, *Die Propheten: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona, Micha* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), p. 151. Cf. also T.H. Robinson and F. Horst, *Die ZwölfKleinen Propheten* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1938), pp. 92-93: Sakkuth and Kaiwan both appear in Akkadian inscriptions as names of astral deities or of one astral deity, Saturn. The authenticity of Amos 5:26-27 is challenged (cf. Robinson and Horst, *op. cit.*). Is it conceivable to accept the cult of Akkadian deities in Israel at the time of Amos? If so, we have to assume an organic infiltration of this cult in Israel. Perhaps however, this passage reflects a forced infiltration conditioned by a political situation. This political situation could point to the tribe relationship to Assyria under Menahem of Israel. Political domination of Assyria may be responsible for Akkadian deities in Israel. This would mean that Amos 5:26-27 is non-authentic.

Cf. Hosea 5:8-6:6 and Weiser's commentary on pp. 40ff. in the book cited above. Hosea 5:8-6:6 belongs in the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war (735-734). In 738 Tiglath-pileser III subdued Rezin of Syria and Menahem of Israel. Tiglath-pileser, however, had to return and prtect himself against the Medes and the people of Urartu. Arameans and Israelites took advantage of this situation and made an alliance with one another. To force Judah to join this alliance Pekah of Israel and Rezin of Damascus marched toward Jerusalem. Ahaz sent for help to Assur. The Assyrians returned and conquered Damascus in 732 and then went against Israel, which then surrendered. Cf. also Albrecht Alt, "Hosea 5:8-6:6," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift,* XXX (1919), pp. 537-568, and Hentschke, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

[2] Hosea 6:4.

In this [illegible]

[illegible]

in their relationship with Yahwe. They knew from the New Years festival that Yahwe would raise the king after three days,[1] and they knew that after the drought came rain. In other words, the people were caught in cultic cyclical patterns of salvation. Against this Hosea pronounces judgment. The remarkable thing is that the word of the prophet already is destruction: "therefore will I hew them by the prophets; will I slay them with the words of my mouth."[2] Again we find the identity of thing and word as the quality of the prophetic dabar because it was dabar of Yahwe.

A new view of history is presented by the prophets. Yahwe no longer acts in miracles as he had done in the holy wars through the charisma of the leader.[3] No where do we find a place where the holy breaks into great historical events. The "holy center",[4] where the divine action could join human history, was lost. Cult and monarchy both added to and furthered the secularization, the monarchy because it dismissed Yahwe from his politico-military functions, and the cult because it limited Yahwe by sacred means to a well-defined sacred sphere. Cult here is a servant of the "world", as it is a means to protect the "world" from Yahwe.

---

[1] Hosea 6:2.

[2] Hosea 6:5.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie.., p. 314.

[4] Ibid.

[illegible]

[illegible]. Their [illegible]

[illegible] than [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] and their [illegible] common [illegible].

[illegible], the public [illegible]

[illegible] of evaluation. [illegible]

[illegible]. The [illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The prophetic favoring of the old institution of the holy war and of an emphasis upon obedience to the covenantal god, had to limit the cult in its growth toward overall efficiency.

Actually the prophetic emphases meant death to monarchy and cult, because they cut off their importance and position of power. Yahwe, however was stronger than cult and monarchy. He was active in the profanation of the world because he used men to execute his will. Thus the prophets saw the great historical changes as signs of the activity of Yahwe, and they recognized that Yahwe would use his tools against his people. Still these events would not necessarily mean total destruction; the prophets also saw the possibility of a new encounter through these events.

The political catastrophes would force Israel to face the reality that Yahwe was not like other gods and therefore that his will was not confined to sacrifices and cultic rituals but was a will which demanded faithfulness to him above everything else.

It was Yahwe who announced himself in the restlessness of history.[1] The people were called upon to listen to the word of Yahwe which was not only Yahwe's word as spoken through the prophets, but also through

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 75.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the political events with which the people were faced.[1] Micah did not call only upon Israel and Judah but upon all people.[2] Yahwe's judgment was always a manifestation of himself.[3] Micah proclaimed that the judgment of Yahwe upon Israel was a symbol among the nations for the lordship of Yahwe.

Yahwe used other nations to execute his judgment upon Israel. Isaiah paints a gloomy picture.[4] Yahwe whistles to a nation and it comes from the ends of the earth, arrows sharpened, bows all bent, on horses like the whirlwind, with a lionlike roar.[5] This is an enemy of terrible efficiency. Assyria is the tool of Yahwe, the rod of his anger.[6] Through the Assyrians Yahwe shall do to Jerusalem what he has done to Samaria.[7] The prophet does not under-estimate the power of the great king of Assyria. He very realistically describes his strength. Isaiah dares

---

[1] Micah 1:2ff. The call for listening, for attention to Yahwe, is prophetic terminology: cf. Amos 3:1,13; 4:1; 5:1; Isaiah 1:2, and Weiser, Die Propheten..., p. 207.

[2] Micah 1:2.

[3] Weiser, Die Propheten.., p. 207.

[4] Isaiah 5:26f.

[5] Isaiah 5:27f.

[6] Isaiah 10:5.

[7] Isaiah 10:11.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

to recommend in the face of danger faith in the Lord as the only weapon. He puts against the power of the king of Assyria and of the king of Egypt the even more powerful reality of Yahwe. This power can only be described in the via negationis.[1] The Egyptians are not spirit, they are not God. "The Assyrians shall fall by a sword, not of men."[2]

Thus the prophet sees Yahwe exercising his sovereignty over history. Israel's strength lies, says Isaiah in 30:15-17, in returning and resting, quietness and confidence. In this same connection belong Isaiah 8:5ff. and 7:2-17. In the threat of the Syro-Ephraimitic war Isaiah recommends trust in Yahwe and calls upon the people to rest and be quiet and confident. Ahaz does not ask the sign which is deliverance out of the hands of Damascus and Israel through an action of Yahwe. He builds a new canal to strengthen the defensive power of Jerusalem.[3] Ahaz is not satisfied with the gently flowing waters of Shiloh. The faithlessness of the king is punished through the Assyrian threat coming soon. The gentle waters of Shiloh they despised; now Yahwe will bring up a mighty river, the Euphrates.[4]

---

[1] Isaiah 31:8; 31:3.

[2] Isaiah 31:8 (Revised Standard Version).

[3] Gressmann, op. cit., p. 237.

[4] Isaiah 8:7.

The defense of Judah and Jerusalem is the responsibility of Yahwe and not of the king.[1] The prophetic judgment shows a certain pattern. Violation of the covenantal will of Yahwe and distrust in his ability to be the God of Israel, that means to protect it in its political dangers, is answered with judgment. We spoke about the distrust of Ahaz in the Syro-Ephraimitic war.[2] The result of the distrust was a prophecy about the impending Assyrian threat. Isaiah prophesies the downfall of Samaria,[3] and Isaiah going naked and barefoot was a living symbol of the fate of Egypt and Ethiopia, upon which Judah had set her hope.[4] Sennacherib would come and battle against Jerusalem,[5] but Yahwe would defend the city for his own sake.[6] Jeremiah prophesies the defeat of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.[7]

Finally, we have to discuss the historization of mythology in the prophets. They emphasize the tradition of Israel as the history of Yahwe with his people. The exodus is the birth of Israel, the beginning of the

---

[1] Isaiah 22:8b-11.

[2] Isaiah 7:2-17; 8:1-4.

[3] Isaiah 28:1-4.

[4] Isaiah 20:1-6.

[5] Isaiah 30:15-17.

[6] Isaiah 37:33-35.

[7] Jeremiah 43:8-13 and Ezekiel 29:17-20. Cf. Ernst Jenni, *Die Politischen Voraussagen der Propheten* (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1956), p. 34.

relationship between Yahwe and Israel.[1] There is no attempt by the prophets to make Israel autochthon in Canaan, that is to forget that Israel is a stranger in the country in which she is living. There is also no attempt therefore to explain creation of earth and the powers of nature in a mythic way.[2] No reference is found to an ancient king as arch-father of Israel. Israel's sonship to Yahwe stems from the exodus and has a definite historical origin. When the prophets use mythological language they change the meaning of the myth. The theme of the dragon chaos fight is not the beginning of Israel's history, but the liberation from Egypt is its beginning. Rahab and the dragon Leviathan[3] refer to Egypt as the power which threatens Israel.[4]

---

[1] Amos 2:10,9,11b; 3:2; Hosea 12:9; 13:4; 11:1.

[2] The prophets use mythological language and metaphors but change their original cultic-mythological significance according to their own intentions (cf. Hosea 1-3: sacred marriage; Isaiah 6: throne ascension; the day of Yahwe in Micah: eschatology is historized).

[3] Isaiah 30:7; 27:1.

[4] North, op. cit., p. 49.

Prophet and Kingship

Southern prophets and Davidic kingship. In our section on the monarchy we discussed the different character of the kingship in Judah and in Israel. This difference is also manifest in the reaction of the prophets against these monarchies. We also have seen that the kingship was the "example *par excellence* of disobedience and defection from Yahwe".[1] The coincidence of the rise of monarchy and prophetism suggests the thesis that there exists a relationship between their emergence. We find in the beginning that members of the *nebiim* counsel kings and sometimes criticize them.[2] When the monarchy develops further, those men whom we call "great" prophets stand in continuous criticism of the monarchy. They waged their criticism mainly against the three great offices, kings, priests, and prophets; they accused them of polluting the will of Yahwe and violating the covenant.

The original resistance to any kingship in Israel is preserved by the prophets. They are always aware that the monarchy is something adopted from the surrounding nations; according to the pattern of their neighbors the kings tried to establish their rule. It is peculiar,

---

[1] Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, p. 67.

[2] 2 Samuel 12.

however, that never during the existence of the monarchy in Israel and Judah do we find a positive definition of the kingship. When Deuteronomy draws up its regulations of the kingship the definitions are merely negative; they are really limitations. The kingship is to be prevented from any disturbance of the people's life.[1]

The insights we are able to gain into the character of the Davidic monarchy show a fixed, unflexible situation. Never do we hear that the initiative began with Yahwe; never do we find a prophet designating a new man who has the favor of Yahwe. Never do we find that the people of Judah revolted. They stand faithfully by their established king. They protect the house of the king against revolts of his slaves and servants.[2]

Just because the kingship in Jerusalem is so strongly established, the attacks of the prophets assume even more weight and significance. In an oracle against Israel and Judah, Amos accuses the princes of luxury while the people perish.[3] Zephaniah preaches against the princes wearing foreign garments.[4] Jeremiah violently attacks the kings of his time with the exception of Josiah.

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 264. Cf. Deuteronomy 17:14; 1 Samuel 8:5; Deuteronomy 17:15b-17.

[2] 2 Kings 14:21; 21:24; 23:20.

[3] Amos 6:1ff.; Micah 3:1-4; 3:9-11.

[4] Zephaniah 1:8.

When King Zedekiah inquires from him, Jeremiah tells him that the Babylonians and Chaldeans will stand inside Jerusalem.[1] Yahwe himself will fight against Jerusalem.[2] Jeremiah recommends surrender to the Chaldeans as the only means to save their lives.[3] Evil will come to Jerusalem because of the evildoings of the house of David.[4] The complete denunciation of the Davidic kingship we find in Jeremiah 36:30, where Jeremiah talks about Jehoiakim: "No descendant of his shall sit on the throne of David; and his dead body shall be flung out to the heat by day and to the cold by night..."

For Jeremiah the institution of the monarchy was inevitably subject to the wrath of Yahwe.[5] After the pious Josiah died, his son Jehoiakim tried to kill the prophet after the king had burnt the scroll upon which the

---

[1] Jeremiah 21:4f.

[2] Jeremiah 21:5.

[3] Jeremiah 21:9.

[4] Jeremiah 21:12 and 21:1ff. The chapters 21-24 report oracles against kings and prophets which basically date back to collections of Jeremiah himself. 21:11-14 reflects the peculiarity of the Old Testament attitude toward the kingship, which has its office from Yahwe and therefore is responsible to Yahwe. Cf. Artur Weiser, Der Prophet Jeremia (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952), p. 187, and Hentschke, op. cit., p. 30, who refers to the prose commentary of Baruch.

[5] Jeremiah 34:2-7; 37:3-10,17; 38:1-3,14-23.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

word of Yahwe had been written.[1] Even Jeremiah, however, had some comfort to offer. There will come a day when Yahwe would make a new beginning. The new king will be a "shoot" from the house of David and will be a theocratic official.[2] Preceding this new beginning is the total destruction of the monarchy in Jerusalem, as the texts previously mentioned confirm. The new king is as much a complete new beginning as the new covenant in Jeremiah 31 is a new covenant.[3]

The words which Jeremiah spoke about the monarchy in Jerusalem and other prophets in the north and south also are unparalleled in the history of the ancient Near East. Jeremiah could speak them under the authority and impact of Yahwe's command, although his authority was seriously challenged by the cult and its representatives and by the skepticism current by the time of Jeremiah. Besides Jeremiah, Micah accuses the kings in Jerusalem of injustice and distortion of what is right.[4] Jerusalem

---

[1] Jeremiah 36. E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 178, traces Jeremiah 36 back to Baruch, the scribe of Jeremiah.

[2] Jeremiah 23:5; cf. Hentschke, op. cit., p. 31.

[3] The title of the new king, "Yahwe is our righteousness", יהוה צדקנו, suggests a type of king who is a true representative of Yahwe. In Jerusalem the people said David was their righteousness because the king represented the corporate whole and upon his righteousness the righteousness of the people was dependent. When Yahwe is the righteousness of the people, the king stands in the background. He is not more than a representative of Yahwe's kingship over Israel.

[4] Micah 3:9ff.

shall be entirely destroyed, and shall be like a field.[1] Micah also sees a new possibility, but the kingship is not to be renewed from Jerusalem. Bethlehem, a city of Judah, is to be the root of a new kingship. This separation of Jerusalem and Judah is unique among the prophets.[2]

Jeremiah and Isaiah attack the kings in Jerusalem, accusing them and threatening them, and still this does not imply a total rejection of the Davidic monarchy itself. Rather, all late prophecies in the book of Isaiah dealing with a future king speak of him as a member of the house of David. He is to be a just and faithful king who seeks what is right.[3] When the term צדק is used in Isaiah, the author certainly has in mind the covenantal meaning of this term. He uses the terms of an official in speaking about the king.[4] The title "king" is reserved for the true king, Yahwe.

---

[1] Micah 3:12.

[2] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 130. Perhaps Micah tried to avoid the dynastic development which for Jerusalem was unavoidable. Did he have in mind a monarchy patterned after the north or after the beginning when a king was authorized by Yahwe through a prophet? It is remarkable that Micah neglects the Zion theology which, even when Jerusalem was destroyed, still could be valid, as history would show. Micah also speaks about a king over Israel. Why does he use the term Israel, which denotes the whole people? He certainly has in mind a renewal of the Davidic kingship in its most literal sense. In other words, Micah is thinking of the great kingdom under David as being possible with prophetic charismatic legitimation.

[3] Isaiah 16:5 (late).

[4] Isaiah 9:5f. (late).

will be entirely desert[illegible], as [illegible] like a flood.' which also seems to [illegible] probability, and the [illegible] is not to be removed from [illegible]. Bethlehem, a city of Judah, is to be the birth of a new [illegible]. This [illegible] Jerusalem and Judah is unique among the prophets.[2]

Jeremiah and Isaiah [illegible] the [illegible] for [illegible], [illegible] than and [illegible] more, and still [illegible] [illegible] a local [illegible] of the [illegible], with late [illegible] in the book of [illegible] [illegible] like a [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible]. He is to be [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] when the term ארץ is [illegible], the author certainly meant [illegible] concerned [illegible] this land. He uses the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]. The [illegible] is [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible]

[1] [illegible]

[2] Isaiah 1:7 ([illegible]).

[3] Hasting's D.B. ([illegible]).

Isaiah's attitude towards the kingship becomes clear in the vision in chapter 6. Here the king in Jerusalem is confronted with the true king, Yahwe Sabaoth. Yahwe is sitting upon the royal throne, not the king, who is a usurper of Yahwe's rights. Yahwe is called Sabaoth here, and this is no accident. Yahwe is the leader of armies, the protector in war. Isaiah propagates this basic right of Yahwe and calls the attention of the people to the warrior qualities of Yahwe.[1] Isaiah presents again the old demand of Yahwe: I am your God and you are my people. Isaiah's disciples combine the old tradition of Yahwe as fighter and leader in holy war, with the invulnerable position of Zion,[2] an idea which originally

---

[1] See the section on prophets and the holy war.

[2] Isaiah 30:27-33. In the book of Isaiah we have two different "concepts" of Jerusalem. One is that Jerusalem is a royal city and cultic center. This city will perish; the judgment of Yahwe will bring this destruction. The other idea is Jerusalem, or rather Zion, as the place of revelation of kingship of Yahwe. The prophets understood the kingship of Yahwe as standing in opposition to the kingship of Israel and Jerusalem/Judah. Kingship of Yahwe is one of the motives of judgment on the city and people. The other is the faithlessness of the people. As in the reality of the remnant, salvation and judgment are linked, even form one and the same action of Yahwe.

Isaiah is quite consistent when he rejects the king in Jerusalem to establish the sole kingship of Yahwe (Isaiah 6). The king also is rejected and subject to judgment because he does not trust the true king Yahwe(Isaiah 7:9). The fate of the monarchy is the fate of Jerusalem. However, as Zion, the dwelling place of Yahwe, the city will be retained.

We conclude that those passages speaking of the future glory of Jerusalem are non-authentic to Isaiah. We also have to say that those passages are consistent

Judaism will [illegible]

clear to the Wisdom in [illegible]. Thus the [illegible]

Wisdom is confirmed [illegible], Yahwe [illegible].

[illegible] is either upon the [illegible], [illegible] age [illegible],

in a number of valuable [illegible]. [illegible] together

[illegible], and this is no [illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible], the [illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible] mind of Yahwe and [illegible] of the

[illegible] to the [illegible] qualities [illegible]

[illegible] the old demand of Yahweh [illegible] and you are

[illegible]. [illegible] dissolution [illegible] old tradition

of Yahwe as Creator and Lawgiver [illegible], with the

[illegible] of [illegible]

---

[1] Then the question on [illegible] only was.

[illegible]

[illegible]

We conclude then [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] here to say that [illegible] has quite a different origin.[1] The strength of Yahwe is made useful for the preservation of the city of David.

Isaiah seems to be very close to the official Jerusalemite ideology without really surrendering his characteristics of a prophet of opposition. In the early stages of his writings he calls the northern kingdom Israel and the southern kingdom Judah. After the Syro-Ephraimitic war, however, he calls the north Ephraim.[2] Isaiah can say "both houses of Israel".[3] Possibly Isaiah thought that after the events of the brother-war, Israel forfeited its claim to represent the people of Yahwe.[4]

Danell proposes, however, that Isaiah uses the term Israel in the wider sense. For the prophet, political boundaries do not exist.[5] Isaiah calls Judah "Israel"

---

with the theology of Isaiah and show a great affinity to the content of Deutero-Isaiah. We will have to look for the author of the Jerusalem passages among the disciples of Isaiah who continued and broadened the theology of their master. Possibly one of these disciples was responsible for chapters 40-55. Those passages not by Isaiah but by his disciples shall be marked as late. These late passages will be cited not as representing the individual prophet's view but representing views stated in the prophetic literature.

[1] See the Nathan prophecy and von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg..., p. 62.

[2] Previously this name was used alternately with Israel; cf. Isaiah 9:7ff.

[3] Isaiah 8:14.

[4] Danell, op. cit., p. 186, quotes Rose with whom he disagrees. We shall refer to the opinion of Danell in the paragraph immediately following.

[5] Danell, op. cit., p. 187.

[illegible] a different [illegible].[1] The attempt of [illegible] is made useful for the reconstruction of the [illegible].

[illegible] to the official [illegible] teaching without greatly accommodating his [illegible], and the early [illegible] of his writings [illegible] after the [illegible] [illegible].[2] [illegible]

[illegible], however, [illegible] in the [illegible]. For [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the theology of Justin, and upon [illegible] [illegible]

[2] See the Western [illegible]

[3] [illegible]

[4] [illegible]

because the southern kingdom is a part of the whole. After the downfall of the north, Isaiah does not cease to call the southern kingdom Judah.[1] Possibly Isaiah called Judah, as the remnant, "Israel" after the Assyrians had deported the Israelites. This would mean that he had no hope for the return of the exiles. Isaiah 11:11ff. and 27:12-14, however, report the return of the exiles at the day of the Lord. This would destroy the idea of the remnant Israel as a designation for Judah, unless one thinks of the name as a temporary one, valid as long as the Israelites were in Assyria.[2] The argument about the usage of the name Israel in Isaiah is not conclusive and hypotheses do not lead us further.

In conclusion, we may say that the prophets of the south criticized the Davidic monarchy. They seem to expect, however, the renewal of the Davidic kingship after the destruction. This kingship is not the same as it was before. The ideal king is an official of Yahwe, which means that it remains clear that Yahwe is the true king. The old traditions of the holy war and covenantal righteousness influence the picture of the new kingship. In other words, the new king will be closer to Saul than

---

[1] Isaiah 22:8,21; 37:31f.

[2] If one is convinced that the cited passages of 11:11ff. and 27:12-14 are late, the problem is removed for followers of the remnant idea. We count the passages cited non-Isaianic; they assume the dispersion of both Judah and Israel.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

to David where his obligations and functions are concerned.

Prophets and monarchy in the north. The monarchy of the northern kingdom, Israel, stood on a very different basis compared to the kingship in Judah and Jerusalem. Basically the old charismatic form of kingship never had been forgotten. All attempts of some kings to assimilate their kingship to the southern example apparently failed, for we have no continuity or formation of dynasty like that of the house of David. If we find dynasties at all, they have a short life. Yahwe's judgment withdraws their royal rights from them by calling another man to the throne through a prophet.

Another difference between north and south is that we never hear about a covenant between a northern king and Yahwe. This does not mean that the Israelites lived without covenant. It means that the covenant in the north was the old covenant between Yahwe and people.[1] The king had no special cultic function and did not represent the corporate whole. He was kept close to the prophetic interpretation of kingship: the king was an official of Yahwe.[2] The king in the north represented a continuation of the old charismatic leader.

---

[1] E. Nielsen, op. cit., p. 341.

[2] Hentschke, op. cit., p. 25.

Already the institution of the kingship at Gilgal was an act of rebellion against Yahwe.[1] Faithlessness, disobedience, and arrogance made Israel long for a king and Yahwe fulfilled their wish. This was a gift of anger. Yahwe gives the kings and takes them away; the kings are no help to Israel, as it is threatened with destruction.[2] Again we find the old motif of prophetic anger: the people did not trust in Yahwe, who was their real king. They trusted in chariots and in their own great might. Kingship of Yahwe and kingship in Samaria cannot exist side by side. Yahwe does not allow any competitor.[3]

Hosea identifies himself with the people, who mourn the fact that they are without a king, a leader. Because the king is dead and Yahwe is not accepted as king, the people despair. And what could the king do? Mere words, false oaths, alliances are his work.[4] Hosea confronts the king with the true king, Yahwe. The king is dead,[5] and Yahwe is not served as king. The only chance of survival would be with him.

---

[1] Hentschke, op. cit., p. 25.

[2] Hosea 13:4-11.

[3] Hosea 3:4; 8:4; 13:13b-15.

[4] Hosea 10:3-4.

[5] The text probably refers to the time after the assasination of Pekah and after the Assyrian invasion. All that was left of the kingdom was a fragment of a state; cf. Weiser, Die Propheten..., p. 64.

The final word of Hosea about the king in Samaria is that he has to disappear completely when the original husband-wife relationship between Yahwe and Israel was renewed. Many days they will be without a king before they will return to Yahwe.[1] How Hosea thought of the ideal situation is shown in Hosea 2:19ff. Between Yahwe and Israel there shall be love without end. The berith is established through faithfulness and mercy. Here the old covenantal terms חסד and צדק appear. Yahwe is king over Israel. His kingship is not distorted or usurped by an earthly king.

Hosea joins Amos in his condemnation of the kingship. The priests deny Amos the right to proclaim his destructive word against Jeroboam in Bethel.[2] Zion and Samaria Yahwe will deliver to destruction. Again the reason for this punishment is false confidence.[3] The people have forgotten that it was Yahwe who brought them from Egypt.[4] They tried to stop the prophets from

---

[1] Hosea 3:4f.: the words "and David their king..." are difficult. How does David suddenly appear here in the north? It is difficult to conceive that Hosea would have thought of the monarchy in Jerusalem as the ideal kingship and therefore recommend it for Israel. We have to agree with Weiser, Die Propheten..., p. 23, that "and David their king..." is Judaic addition. Cf. also Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 126; against this see Danell, op. cit., p. 154 and Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 87.

[2] Amos 7:10ff.

[3] Amos 6:1.

[4] Amos 2:10.

prophesying the dabar of Yahwe.[1] The close relationship between Yahwe and Israel which once meant life to the people now means doom.[2] To seek Yahwe is the only chance the people have. But they go to Bethel, Gilgal, and Beersheba instead. They trust in the sacrifices at those places. They seek Yahwe where he is not to be found.[3] Bethel was a royal sanctuary and the royal cult there is particularly criticized. The leadership of Yahwe is proclaimed as over against the leaders of Israel, those who lie luxuriously on ivory couches and stretch themselves on divans.[4]

---

[1] Amos 2:12.

[2] Amos 3:1f.

[3] Amos 5:4ff.

[4] Amos 6:4f.

The Attitude of the Prophets Toward Jerusalem

The attitude of the prophets toward Jerusalem as the sanctuary and seat of the ark, was not unanimous. We find both harsh condemnation of Jerusalem and expressions that tie the hope for future salvation to the sanctuary on Mount Zion. Jerusalem, king, priest, and prophets are the objects of Jeremiah's violent proclamation of doom and destruction. Priests and prophets accuse Yahwe of not fulfilling his word, "all will be well with you". Priests and prophets claimed to have a dabar of Yahwe when they proclaimed "peace, peace". Now they hold Yahwe responsible when the proclamations of their own hearts are not realized.

On the contrary, Yahwe will come like a scorching wind to destroy Jerusalem.[1] Yahwe proves priests and prophets wrong. They have lulled the people into security although there was no security.[2] The dabar of Yahwe is not salvation, but judgment.[3] At the day of judgment the bones of king, priests, princes, and prophets shall be cast out and spread in the sun together with the bones of the inhabitants

---

[1] Jeremiah 4:9-12.

[2] Jeremiah 6:14; 8:11; 14:13.

[3] The scorching wind from the desert is a motif of the Sinai theophany which Jeremiah uses here. According to that tradition this wind accompanies the divine epiphany when Yahwe comes to judge. Cf. Jeremiah 18:17; Hosea 13:15; 1 Kings 19:11; Exodus 15:8,10; Psalm 18:11,16 and Weiser, Der Prophet Jeremia, p. 45.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

of Jerusalem. The irony is that sun, moon and stars now shine on the bones of those who once had worshipped them. Sun, moon, and stars could not help those who served them; they only can help in the complete disintegration of their former worshippers.[1] The king, princes, priests and prophets shall be dung of the earth. But even this shall not be so terrible as the judgment itself. The living shall envy the dead in spite of their terrible fate.[2]

How terrible the condemnation of Jerusalem and its temple must have sounded in the ears of listeners is evidenced through their desire to kill Jeremiah. How does he dare to speak against the house of the Lord?[3] This, even though Jeremiah offers an alternative. If the people listen to the voice of the Lord he shall repent of the evil which he intended to inflict upon Jerusalem and the temple.[4] How dangerous the situation was shows in the desire of the people and the priests to lynch the prophet after he was arrested. The officials of the king saved him. Chapter 26 is a report of Baruch about the temple speech of Jeremiah. In Chapter 7 we have the words of Jeremiah himself.[5] The

---

[1] Weiser, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, p. 75. Cf. also Wilhelm Rudolf, *Jeremia* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1947), p. 57, and Jirku, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-5.

[2] Jeremiah 8:1-3; 13:12-14.

[3] Jeremiah 26.

[4] Jeremiah 26:13.

[5] Weiser, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, p. 67.

temple is called a cave of robbers,[1] and its fate will be the same as the fate of Shiloh.[2]

Yahwe is not limited to the sanctity of the temple. The people are subject to the will of Yahwe, which they have violated in their wickedness (Ch. 7, v.12). Yahwe however has nothing to do with the cult in Jerusalem. When the punishment comes the people may go and pray to the gods to whom they sacrifice, gods which are utterly powerless.[3] Jeremiah is not allowed to intercede for the people.

There is only one text in Jeremiah which shows a positive attitude toward the temple.[4] This probably is an attempt to extend the words of hope to the temple.[5] The passage reveals cultic-priestly terminology with its expectation of a material sanctity of this particular place, the sanctuary on Zion.[6] The old tradition of the material holiness of the central sanctuary, and of Jerusalem as its location, appears here. Considering the attitude of Jeremiah against the cult and its representatives, we have to assume that this passage is late.

---

[1] Jeremiah 7:11.

[2] Jeremiah 7:12f.

[3] Jeremiah 11:1-14.

[4] Jeremiah 31:38ff.

[5] Jeremiah 31:4,35-37; 30:18.

[6] Weiser, Der Prophet Jeremia, p. 297, and Staerk, op. cit., p. 16.

We find a more favorable attitude toward Jerusalem and the temple in the book of Isaiah. The prophet sometimes proclaims destruction over Judah and Jerusalem;[1] his disciples, however, take the impact of his message of doom away by proclaiming the future glory of Zion. We find the idea of Zion as the spiritual center of the world. From Zion the nations will receive their instruction.[2] In his depiction of paradise Isaiah says the holy mountain will be the location of this age of peace.[3] The flame of Yahwe is kindled in Zion and the holy mountain is the place of his dwelling; a nation strong and triumphant will bring homage to Yahwe on Mount Zion.[4] In all the storms against it Zion shall not be overcome.[5] By Nob[6] Zion is threatened, but Yahwe Sabaoth will defeat this threat.[7]

A contemporary of Isaiah, Micah, does not join Isaiah in his positive statements on the fate of the temple. The temple and Zion shall be plowed like a field, and Yahwe

---

[1] Isaiah 1:8f.; 2:18ff.

[2] Isaiah 2:2ff. (late); against Staerk, op. cit., p. 20.

[3] Isaiah 11:9 (late).

[4] Isaiah 31:9; 8:18; 18:7 (late).

[5] Isaiah 29:5,8 (late).

[6] The name Nob is doubtful in the text and its site is uncertain. Cf. Nehemiah 11:32, G.B. Gray, *The Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX*, Vol. XX of *The International Critical Commentary*, ed. Charles Augustus Briggs (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 209.

[7] Isaiah 10:32f. (v. 33 late, cf. Gray as mentioned above, p. 211.)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

himself will witness against Jerusalem.[1] Jerusalem will be laid in ruins and all her life, from the very beginning, shall be condemned.[2] As the disciples of Isaiah balanced the words against Jerusalem with hopeful prophecies, thus redactors of Micah balanced the words of destruction with more positive prophecies. The rebuilding of Jerusalem is announced.[3] The rulership of Yahwe after the exile is located on Mount Zion.[4]

The divine plan of salvation has its beginning in Zion.[5] Jerusalem with its sanctuary is the point in time and history from whence Yahwe shall begin his reign.[6] We find that the disciples of Isaiah, more than any other prophetic writers, adopted the official ideology of Mount Zion as it was propagated by the cult in Jerusalem. The election of Zion and the maintenance of the sacredness of Zion through all destruction reminds us of the royal cult ideology which essentially maintained the same. We have seen, however, that even the disciples of Isaiah are not entirely on the line of the cult. Old prophetic traditions like the holy war ideology have influenced them and altered

---

[1] Micah 3:12; 1:2ff.

[2] Micah 6:9ff.

[3] Micah 7:11ff. (late); cf. parallels in Isaiah 2:1-4.

[4] Micah 4:11-13 (late).

[5] Isaiah 28:16.

[6] Isaiah 31:4f. (we translate the preposition על with "on, upon" in verse 4b). Cf. 4:2ff. (late); Psalm 46, etc.

the emphasis in their Zion theology.

In the prophetic traditions about Ahiah of Shiloh we find the remarkable feature that Jerusalem is considered the sanctuary even for the north. The foundation of competitive royal sanctuaries by Jeroboam I in Bethel and Dan is considered disobedience and faithlessness.[1] However, while the cultic separation from the south is condemned, the political separation is welcomed and legitimated. Here for the first time we meet the distinction between the cultic and the political role of Jerusalem, between Jerusalem as the royal city of the house of David and Jerusalem as the location of the ark.[2]

The tradition connected with the ark apparently exercised its great weight. Against this early northern appreciation of Jerusalem as the city of the ark sanctuary now stands a later depreciation of Jerusalem as place of the house of David. The well-known messianic prophecies in Amos 9:11f., Isaiah 9:6, 11:1, Micah 5:1, Jeremiah 23:5, Ezekiel 34:23f. and 37:24 never mention Jerusalem or Zion. As name of a specific location we hear about the Bethlehemite clan of Ephrat,[3] but nothing about Zion.[4] The pre-exilic

---

[1] 1 Kings 12:26ff.; 14:8f.

[2] Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 178.

[3] Micah 5:1; Isaiah 11:1.

[4] Zechariah 9:9f. is post-exilic and therefore not to be considered here. Cf. Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 181.

prophets do not speak of Jerusalem as the city of the messianic king. This can only mean that Jerusalem was not important for the messianic kingship.

We do find, however, a recognition of Jerusalem as city of the sanctuary, which means of the presence of Yahwe, as the city where Yahwe dwells. Yahwe's voice is coming from Zion.[1] When Micah criticizes Jerusalem he criticizes it as the location of the sanctuary, which was the origin of perversion.[2] When the nations make their pilgrimage to Jerusalem they will receive the right instruction. We find emphasis on the "sanctuary" as mediator of Yahwe's torah. Jeremiah sees the tribes of a "new Israel" come to Yahwe.[3] Jerusalem is the place where Yahwe is present. Even the cult disappears in the background. Here we find the same distinction between Jerusalem as sanctuary and as city of David that we found in 1 Kings 12. What are the consequences of this distinction?

---

[1] Amos 1:2; cf. also Isaiah 8:18; 31:9.

[2] Micah 3:12.

[3] Jeremiah 31:6.

Yahwe is King and Messiah

Prophetic eschatology and the remnant. Threats and proclamations of punishment outnumber by far the positive statements in the writings of the prophets. This is the reason why one has called these prophets "prophets of doom" in contrast to their adversaries, the "prophets of salvation".[1] The prophets of doom are also called prophets with an eschatological message. They proclaim the eschaton, or the end of the old situation of covenant, kingship and cult, and expect a new to follow the radical end. Jeremiah's new covenant, for example, is such an eschatological reality. The old covenant was broken by Israel and Yahwe punished and destroyed Israel. The new covenant is as different from the old as the new Israel is different from the old. Insofar as the prophets assume the coming of something new after the end, their eschatological proclamations really are prophecies of salvation instead of doom. Of course, this salvation is quite different from that salvation proclaimed by the "false" prophets. The prophetic salvation goes through destruction and defeat and the end of all old orders of life. This destruction really is a necessity, a necessary action of Yahwe to force his people "home".

---

[1] See the section on criticism of the "great" prophets against the "false" prophets.

The old institutions of kingship, priesthood, and cult had forfeited their chance. They were supposed to be officials of Yahwe; instead, they assumed a position of their own right and perverted the relationship between Yahwe and Israel. Yahwe himself has to act to establish new conditions for an undisturbed covenantal relationship between Yahwe and Israel.

A prominent feature of the eschatological proclamations of the prophets is the "day of Yahwe". The first one to confront his countrymen with the "day of Yahwe" was Amos:

> "Woe to you who desire the day of the Lord! What then, does the day of the Lord mean to you? It is darkness and not light; as though a man were fleeing from a lion, and a bear should meet him! Or as if he entered his house and rested his hand upon the wall, and a serpent bit him! Is not the day of the Lord darkness and not light, and blackness with no brightness in it?"[1]

The day of Yahwe was the New Year's day when he ascended to the throne. The ark was brought in procession up to the temple. The people experienced the arrival of their strong and merciful God.[2] This day was a day of salvation for the people of Yahwe.[3] Amos opposes this popular interpretation of the "day of Yahwe". It is not a day to be desired, not a day of light. Amos takes the

---

[1] Amos 5:18-20; cf. also 5:21-27.

[2] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 213.

[3] See the above section on the New Years and enthronement festival.

"day of Yahwe" out of its cultic contexts[1] and reverses its meaning. The "day of Yahwe" means judgment. As the people carried their idols, thus shall they be carried away into exile.[2]

That Amos really proclaims his message of doom against the cult celebrating the New Year's festival is evidenced by Amos 5:21ff. Yahwe does not care for sacrifices and offerings and does not delight in the singing of songs and the melody of lyres. It is clear that in the background of this prophetic "day of Yahwe" stands the cultic New Years festival. The assurance of this festival, however, is repudiated by Amos. The effect of the "day of Yahwe" will be just the opposite of what the people expect. On the "day of Yahwe" everything high and proud shall be humbled, the idols will vanish and the people will seek shelter in caves of rocks before the dreadful presence of Yahwe.[3]

Although the term "day of Yahwe" is not used, we will have to add the proclamations of the destruction of

---

[1] In the New Years festival the day of God was the day when the deity "awoke" or was resurrected as Baal, for example, when rain overcame drought. As we have said, this marked the beginning of Baal's reign, or in Israel, Yahwe's reign. The day of Yahwe for the cult meant the new beginning of life, or the cyclical renewal of salvation.

[2] Amos 5:27.

[3] Isaiah 2:5-22.

Jerusalem and Samaria to the proclamations of the "day of Yahwe". From our point of view the "day of Yahwe", which means the end, was identical with the destruction, especially of Jerusalem, upon which the hopes of Israel rested. Yahwe was dwelling in Zion, but this did not prevent him from pronouncing judgment on the city which loved bribes and associated with thieves.[1] Yahwe will turn his hand against her,[2] and will forsake his own house.[3] Amos proclaims such a radical and total destruction that he does not even assure that a remnant will survive. He did not go beyond a "perhaps" of a remnant.[4]

The prophets do not rest with their proclamation of doom. They also have to offer a comforting message of restoration. It is not at all a paradox that we find the proclamation of doom close together with proclamations of restoration. As we have said before, the *eschaton* is truly an end. What follows is something new which has only

---

[1] Isaiah 1:23.

[2] Isaiah 1:25.

[3] Jeremiah 12:6. Cf. also Jeremiah 22:6b-7; 5:1ff.; 12:20-27.

[4] Cf. Amos 9:8b-15, which marks the end of the canonical book of Amos and follows upon a terrible refutation of Israel. A redactor tried to ease the impact of that message of doom. We consider 9:8b-15 as late, with Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II*, p. 277, also Robinson and Horst, *op. cit.*, p. 107, but against Weiser, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, p. 177. The time of authorship is probably the exile. The house of David had fallen but would be restored (v.11); Jerusalem lies in ruins, but it also shall be rebuilt.

[illegible] with the [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].[1] [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

superficial similarity with the old. Therefore the term restoration is inadequate and Isaiah's term creation is more suited to describe the new reality. After Yahwe had washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and wiped out the blood stains of Jerusalem by the spirit of destruction, he will create over Zion a cloud of smoke and a glow of fire.[1] The cloud and fire remind us of the cloud and fire of the exodus. They were the signs of Yahwe's leadership as the people wandered through the desert. The exodus for the prophets is the creation of Israel because it is the beginning of its relationship to Yahwe.

After the destruction the signs of Yahwe shall stand over Zion as marks of a new creation, to be understood as a new encounter and a new possibility with Yahwe. We know from the new covenant what type of relationship Israel will have with Yahwe in the new covenant. It is a relationship unparalleled in the history of Israel. The time which comes closest to this ideal is the time when Israel lived in the desert and was dependent upon Yahwe's leadership. Zion is the eschatological Mount Sinai.[2] The idea of the mountain of God is now connected with Zion as

---

[1] Isaiah 4:4ff. (late).

[2] Schmid, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 191.

the mountain of God.[1]

The essence of the proclamation of doom which contains salvation is the assumption that a remnant will survive the ultimate destruction. The idea of the remnant includes judgment and separation, or destruction[2] and salvation.[3] The remnant[4] presupposes the judgment and destruction of the majority of the people; emphasis in the prophetic proclamation of the remnant is on salvation.[5]

The remnant has particular prominence in Isaiah.[6] For Isaiah the remnant is connected with his call.[7] What is the significance of this connection? The prophet is called to deliver a message of doom, a message which shall dull the ears and besmear the eyes of the people.[8] The prophet asks how long he shall deliver this message, and

---

[1] Isaiah 2:2-4 (late). The same combination of Sinai and Zion is found in Ezekiel. The kabod of Yahwe leaves Zion before its destruction (Ezekiel 9:3; 11:22) and returns together with the exiles to Mount Zion to dwell there forever (cf. Ezekiel 43:1ff.; 44:4; 48:35, and Schmid, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 191.

[2] Amos 5:3; Isaiah 10:22.

[3] Isaiah 10:21; 37:32; 2 Kings 19:31; Micah 4:7.

[4] We know four terms in the Hebrew Old Testament for remnant, שׁאר, פלט, שׂרד, and יתר.

[5] Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., IV, p. 204.

[6] Östborn, op. cit., p. 134, and J. Fichtner, "Jahwes Plan in der Botschaft des Jesaja," ZAW, LXIII (1951), p. 29.

[7] Isaiah 6:11ff.

[8] Isaiah 6:10.

the answer is: until the day of destruction has come and only a remnant is left.[1] And even this remnant has to go through destruction; it is not exempt. The meaning of this passage is that the prophet - and we may generalize - as all prophets, is called to proclaim the will of Yahwe, the message of doom, until this message of doom is made superfluous because it has been fulfilled.

The coming of Yahwe always means destruction to man because he is sinful. Isaiah experienced this in his own person. He was cleansed. It means the same for Israel, to whom Yahwe has revealed himself as the holy and to whom Israel did not answer in returning to him. The coming of Yahwe meant destruction at the "day of Yahwe". In his prophets Yahwe came to his people, but they refused Yahwe in his prophets, and this prompted their destruction. In the personal fate of Isaiah the fate of all Israel is symbolized. The coming of Yahwe always means both salvation and destruction. Salvation for Israel is the remnant. The remnant is called Israel and is never called a remnant out of Israel (שאר מישראל). The remnant is the true Israel.[2]

In Isaiah and his disciples the remnant existed

---

[1] Isaiah 6:12f. (verse 13b possibly is late; however it reflects well the content of the preceding verse.)

[2] This is contrary to Mowinckel's thesis that because of the term שאר מישראל all Israel is the remnant, something which fits in his cultic explanation of the remnant. Cf. Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., IV, p. 204.

already as a symbol among the people. The remnant had its origin in the calling of the prophets. Later the remnant existed in those who listened to the words of the prophets.[1] The remnant has its origin not in the quality of those who are saved, but only in the saving action of Yahwe.[2] Nothing is said about a particular holiness of the remnant. The zeal of Yahwe Sabaoth and his faithfulness are responsible for the existence of the remnant.[3] Herntrich has emphasized the simultaneous present and future character of the remnant.[4] The remnant is closely connected with the Messiah. Emmanuel is the king of the remnant.[5] The connection sometimes is so close that it is difficult to decide whether the cornerstone[6] is only the remnant or is the Messiah. In Deutero-Isaiah, remnant and ebed cannot be separated. Possibly they are identical.

---

[1] Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., IV, p. 205. Cf. also Isaiah 8:16-18; Jeremiah 1:5. The remnant is those who believe: Isaiah 7:9.

[2] Micah 2:12; 5:6; 4:7; 4:1-4; 5:1ff. (all these passages are of suspect authenticity).

[3] Isaiah 37:32; 10:20; Jeremiah 31:2; Amos 5:15; Jeremiah 50:20; Micah 7:18.

[4] Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., p. 210. The remnant is present in Genesis 7:23; 45:7; I Kings 19:18; Amos 5:15; Isaiah 1:8,9; 8:16-18. The peculiar merger of the "now" and "then" is apparent in the messianic texts of Isaiah 7:10ff.; 9:5 (late). The ענו are the remnant. If the remnant is a present entity, at least the possibility of identifying it with a historical group is given.

[5] Buber, Prophetic Faith, p. 140. Cf. Isaiah 9:6f. (late); 7:13ff.

[6] Isaiah 28:16,17.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The Messiah. There is little to say about the Messiah. We have already discussed the main points in the last section on the monarchy.

The Messiah is Yahwe in Israel. The anointed is an official of Yahwe. He has no rights in himself. As king he is supposed to be the symbol of the kingship of Yahwe over Israel. When the kings forsook Yahwe and established themselves according to the pattern of the surrounding kingships, Yahwe withdrew himself from the kingship and sent the prophets to preach the punishment which Yahwe would inflict upon his people. Beside the message of doom stands the message of salvation. A remnant shall survive but shall go through the punishment and Yahwe shall awake a new king for this remnant Israel, a new anointed.

Sometimes[1] this new king is supposed to be a member of the house of David.[2] However, the prophecies which connect the expectation of a Messiah with a king somehow related to David, are few compared to the number of more general promises of salvation.[3] We discussed the Isaiah passage 7:1-19 where Emmanuel is not related to the house of David but rather seems to be understood as against

---

[1] However, not always; cf. Micah 5:2 and page 332.

[2] Hosea 3:5; Isaiah 9:7 (late); 11:1ff. (late); Micah 5:1ff.; Jeremiah 30:8-9; 18-21.

[3] Gressmann, op. cit., p. 91.

King Ahaz and his house. Even 9:2-7 does not say explicitly that the Messiah will be a member of the house of David. It says merely that he shall sit upon the throne of David. At least it is possible to understand this future king on the throne of David as not related to David.

We have discussed the relationship of the prophets to tradition, especially to the holy war. Yahwe was re-established as the leader of the militia of Israel; Yahwe is the only protection Judah and Jerusalem have. Isaiah calls the king an official of Yahwe, which reminds us of the charismatic leaders and Saul, who were completely dependent upon the charisma of Yahwe. Through them Yahwe was the king of Israel. The future king of Israel seems to have very much the characteristics of this charismatic king. Sometimes even the person of a king seems to be superfluous. Jeremiah conceives of Yahwe as sitting on the throne of David in Jerusalem; Jerusalem shall be called the throne of Yahwe, and all nations shall gather there to celebrate the name of Yahwe in Jerusalem.[1] The birth of Emmanuel, "God with us", assumes an earthly representative of Yahwe. Emmanuel is the name of the true anointed and carries the explanation of the word "Messiah" in itself. Messiah is Emmanuel.

Yahwe is king not because he was enthroned in an

---

[1] Jeremiah 3:18.

enthronement festival. He was not brought up to Mount Zion sitting on the ark. The events of history had established Yahwe's kingship because he had proven himself to be king. Assyria was the rod of his anger and the nations were tools in his hands when he punished Israel. A remnant returned, the true Israel. Sometimes this remnant fulfills the function of the Messiah by being a symbol of Yahwe among the nations.[1] Emmanuel seems to be identical with the remnant when the plans and words of the nations shall have no power because God is with the remnant.[2]

If we may assume that the remnant is identical with those returning out of exile, it is explicitly stated that the remnant shall be a sign to the nations.[3] It seems that we can say that the remnant is the Messiah where the nations are concerned. Whenever we find a messianic text with reference to an individual such as a member of the house of David, the Messiah is seen in inner-Israelite context. Both times it is true that kingship and leadership belong to Yahwe. When the nations come to Zion to celebrate the name of Yahwe they come because they have seen the sign of the remnant.

The sign of the kingship and leadership of Yahwe over the remnant itself is a charismatic leader to whom

---

[1] Micah 5:7ff. (late).

[2] Isaiah 8:9ff.

[3] Isaiah 11:12,16 (late).

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Yahwe has given the gift of wisdom and understanding, knowledge and fear of Yahwe, and above everything the spirit of Yahwe, which always has been the sign of charismatic leadership.[1] Now we are able to explain the distinction between Jerusalem as the city of David and as the city of the sanctuary of Yahwe. Zion will be the throne of Yahwe. His voice shall come from there.[2] Around Zion centers the theology of the remnant. The nations shall make pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Zion is the place where Yahwe is present.

For the messianic king, even if he was conceived as a member of the house of David, Jerusalem was unimportant. Yahwe will call his Messiah from one of the tribes as he had done with the "judges" and with Saul and David. Charismatic leadership stands in contrast to succession and inherited continuity. Yahwe shall take care of the continuity. We find a reference to a messianic king as coming from a small clan in Judah.[3] Charisma and remnant are signs of Yahwe's kingship.

---

[1] Isaiah 11:1ff. (late).

[2] Amos 1:2; Isaiah 8:1; 31:9.

[3] Micah 5:2.

Prophetic Criticism

Social criticism. The development of the monarchy in Israel and Judah and the development of statehood had changed old social orders.[1] The transfer of economy into cities especially furthered these social changes. The rich families in cities, and especially in the king's court, demanded heavy tributes from the peasantry. The peasants could barely maintain their personal freedom. Their old honorable position of fighting in the militia had been lost through the development of the army into a modern mercenary force.

The nobility in the cities annexed fields and houses, they "crush a yeoman and his house, a man and his possession."[2] Amos has always been called a socialist among the prophets. This can be justified by the strong stand Amos takes against those who trample on the needy, change prices, scales, and make slaves out of those who cannot live on their earnings and the fruits of their fields. They buy the poor for silver and pay as little as a pair of sandals for a person.[3] The rich live in luxury while the people perish.[4] Justice is foreign to them. They eat the flesh of the

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 73.

[2] Micah 2:2; Isaiah 5:8.

[3] Amos 8:1ff.

[4] Amos 6:1-8.

people. In other words, the poverty of the country is due to the pitiless tactics of the rich.[1] Orphans and widows do not get their rights; justice is determined by bribes. The rulers are thieves who live at the cost of the poor.[2]

Prophetic criticism of the cult. Again and again we had opportunity to emphasize the opposition of the prophets to the cult as it was practiced in Israel and Judah/Jerusalem. Their main opposition was directed against the cultic assurance of salvation, which was futile because it made the people live in the illusion of protection by Yahwe when there was no protection; instead, Yahwe himself was the cause of their destruction. Yahwe demanded a life of faithfulness and righteousness - both covenantal terms - as a basis for the relationship between himself and Israel. Besides this general criticism we find a number of specific attacks on the practices of the cult.

Amos and Hosea refute the cult at Gilgal, Bethel, and Beersheba,[3] and the pilgrimages of the people to those places. Bethel is a place of Israel's adultery, where the people forsake Yahwe and worship the bull.[4] In Gilgal, demon

---

[1] Micah 3:1ff.; cf. also Micah 3:9ff.

[2] Isaiah 1:23; 3:12-14; 10:1ff.

[3] Hosea 4:15; Amos 5:5.

[4] Hosea 6:10; 10:5ff.

sacrifices are offered,[1] and this is the place where Yahwe conceived hatred against Israel.[2] For Hosea, cult places are places of sin.[3] Yahwe delights in knowledge of his will rather than in sacrifices and offerings.[4] Hosea is joined in his argument against sacrifices and offerings by Jeremiah.[5] The day of punishment will not spare the sanctuaries.[6] The first general criticism of the cult we find in Amos.[7] Later prophets used the same pattern.[8] The liturgical terminology of the cult is used by Hosea to say precisely the opposite of what this liturgy was originally intended to express.[9] The assurance of resurrection and salvation which would come like the winter rain, really meant judgment for Israel.[10]

---

[1] Hosea 12:12.

[2] Hosea 9:15. This is a possible reference to the crowning of Saul in 1 Samuel 11:15. Cf. Hentschke, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[3] Hosea 4:15.

[4] Hosea 6:6.

[5] Jeremiah 11:15-17; Amos 4:4.

[6] Amos 3:14; 5:4ff.; 7:9; 9:1.

[7] Amos 5:21-27.

[8] Isaiah 1:10-15.

[9] Hosea 6:1-6.

[10] Behind this scheme very probably stands the idea of the dying and rising god Baal, who personifies the powers of nature. Cf. Hentschke, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

The cultic significance of the "day of Yahwe" was attacked by the prophets because it assured the people of the never-ceasing mercy of Yahwe. Hosea combined the theology of the "day of Yahwe" with the exodus tradition. The exodus tradition also was stripped of its cultic significance and used by the prophet to show Israel what a true relationship to Yahwe meant. At the "day of Yahwe" the people would call Yahwe "my husband" and no longer "my Baal".[1] "Cease to do evil and learn to do good; seek justice, restrain the oppressor" Isaiah reminds his countrymen; offerings are worthless, and the odor of sacrifices is an abomination to Yahwe.[2]

It has been suggested that Isaiah shows a stronger interest in the cult than other prophets,[3] because of the circumstances of his call and of his Zion theology. He uses much cultic terminology to explain the right relationship between Yahwe and people.[4] This is not quite true. We have tried to show the emphasis on the kingship in Isaiah's Zion theology. Zion is not the place of the cult, it is rather the place of the presence of Yahwe, the true king of Israel. Here Yahwe is Sabaoth. Isaiah renews the old holy

---

[1] Hosea 2:15-17.

[2] Isaiah 1:13,17.

[3] Hentschke, op. cit., p. 99.

[4] Ibid.

war tradition. Thus we must say that Isaiah does not show a stronger interest in the cult than the other prophets, but adopts a part of the traditional Zion theology to establish the kingship of Yahwe on Zion as over against the kingship of the house of David in that same place.[1]

Reference to the "ancient paths" also is made in Jeremiah.[2] The people did not listen to the words of Yahwe; they despised the torah of Yahwe. Instead they burnt frankincense and burnt offerings which Yahwe would not accept. The most precious gifts cannot disguise the disobedience of the people. Yahwe did not command them to burn offerings and dedicate sacrifices when he brought the people out of Egypt. "Listen to my voice" was the will of Yahwe, but they did not listen. Jerusalem shall be cast away. We do not hear anything about sparing the temple from this destruction.[3]

The prophetic condemnation of idolatry. Closely connected with the rejection of sacrifices and burnt offerings is the vigorous refutation of the worship of gods other than Yahwe in the writings of the prophets. These other gods were mostly fertility deities, as we know from Canaanite religion. They must have had considerable

---

[1] See the section above on Yahwe as king and Messiah.

[2] Jeremiah 6:16-22.

[3] Jeremiah 7:21-8:13.

influence in Israel. It is only fair to say that our texts probably do not record the full impact of those gods and goddesses[1] upon pre-exilic Israel because of the deuteronomic influence on the historical writings and possible eliminations of passages which would heap too much guilt upon the heads of the forefathers. The canonical Old Testament is a strongly prophetic book. It favors the prophets more than the contemporaries of the prophets favored them.

The exile proved that the message of doom was right. This was an undisputable legitimation of the prophets, however in a time and among a people who were no longer bothered by the same problems and decisions as pre-exilic Israel. Therefore our traditions offer mostly indirect references to the worship of other gods, to the character and essence of these gods, and to the true influence which they had on popular religion in Israel. In our knowledge of popular and official Israelite religion, we are strongly dependent upon the words of the prophets which attack this religion. It might be called popular Yahwism, but it perverted the true faith and despised the covenant, which demanded an exclusive relationship to Yahwe. We find a great variety of gods of fertility with more or less importance for the

---

[1] James Pritchard, Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1943), especially pp. 81ff., has made available vast archaeological data concerning numerous female figurines found in Palestine. These findings support the supposition that the influence of goddesses in popular Israelite religion was stronger than the Old Testament records admit.

life of the people. The general character of this popular religion is agricultural, with an emphasis on fertility and prosperity.

The problem of worshipping gods other than Yahwe is introduced to the Israelites through their relationship with the inhabitants of the country which they invaded. Exodus already condemns intermarriage as a symbol of a close relationship between Canaanites and Israelites because the daughters of Canaan would make the sons of Israel run after their gods.[1] We hear about the role of all the small baalim, which

> "were accepted by the people as a fact, but treated as indispensable religious requisite for the successful fertilization of the soil, for which Yahwe the wanderer and warrior was not competent. Even now they wished to acknowledge as a people Yahwe only; whereas the fertility deities they knew only, and this in a private and intimate manner."[2]

However, for the prophets there was no compromise. Yahwe demanded obedience and allegiance to him only. In a relationship with Yahwe no place was left for private religion of the baalim, no matter how unimportant they were. The prophets were realistic enough to see that the influence of the Canaanite religion soon would pervert the Yahwe faith. Indeed, when the prophets arose this perversion had already deeply formed the religion of Israel.

---

[1] Exodus 34:16.

[2] Buber, Prophetic Faith, p. 74.

One point of entrance for foreign gods was the monarchy, especially the kingship in Jerusalem. The Jerusalem cult basically was a Canaanite cult determined by the ancient traditions of this old Amorite city. Later Solomon married women from other nations who brought their deities with them; he gave these gods room in his palace or built them their own sanctuaries.[1] The Sidonian Ashtart/Asherah, the Ammonite Milcom, and Chemosh the god of the Moabites, were worshipped by Solomon.[2]

King Ahab of Israel married Jezebel, a Sidonian princess, and again foreign gods are connected with the marriage of a foreign woman.[3] Ahab erected an altar to Baal in the house of Baal in Samaria. Since Samaria was a foundation of Omri, everything in Samaria was built by Israelites, who even built a house to Baal, the chief adversary of Yahwe. Hosea is famous for his attacks on the adultery and whoredom of Israel, who runs after Baal, the "fat bull".[4] Isaiah also speaks of Israel as a harlot.[5] The people worship the work of their own hands.[6]

---

[1] 1 Kings 11:1ff.

[2] 1 Kings 11:5-7.

[3] 1 Kings 16:31ff.

[4] Hosea 4:11-18; 6:10; 10:5ff.; 9:10.

[5] Isaiah 1:21.

[6] Isaiah 2:8; also 10:11; 31:7. Isaiah uses the term אלילם which is a diminutive for אל ironically; the idols are not gods, they are only little gods.

In Jerusalem the people established gardens of the Phoenician god Adonis, a god of vegetation and fertility, who in this role was closely related to Baal.[1] Jeremiah uses an Egyptian ritual, the desecration of enemies through breaking of pottery upon which the names of the desecrated are written, to illustrate the power of the word of Yahwe.[2] The same passage also shows the influence of Assyrian-Babylonian astral religion. The people offer to the astral deities on the roofs of their houses.[3]

Besides the influence of Baal, we have to reckon with the influence of the great mother goddess, the Babylonian-Accadian Ishtar.[4] Buber considers the influence of the "queen of heaven" even greater than that of the great Baal.[5] If the religious situation of the Jewish community at Elephantine has anything to say regarding the pre- and post-exilic situation in Israel, it would support Buber's observation. Sacred prostitution, although probably a common feature of all fertility cults, may possibly point in the direction of a mother goddess who in the beginning

---

Cf. Jirku, op. cit., for a different opinion on p. 196. He suggests that the term אליל should be derived from the Babylonian EN 'LIL, a god of the Babylonians.

[1] Isaiah 17:10; cf. Jirku, op. cit., p. 200.

[2] Jeremiah 19:11f.; Weiser, Der Prophet Jeremia, p. 170.

[3] Introduced by Manasseh (1 Kings 21:3ff.) and removed by Josiah (2 Kings 23:5,12), this type of cult, together with the sacrifice of children, and other foreign cults, seems to have returned after the death of Josiah. Cf. Jeremiah 8:1ff.; Zephaniah 1:5.

[4] Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17,19; cf. Jirku, op. cit., p. 204.

[5] Buber, Prophetic Faith, p. 121.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

stands at the side of a male deity exercising sacred marriage as an example for their worshippers, who join in this sacred rite. Soon the mother goddess enjoyed superiority over the male deity.

We know about sacred prostitution from Jeremiah and Hosea.[1] The terms used to designate the foreign cults, זנות and זנונים, are derived from the verb זנה, which has the meaning "to whore", "to commit adultery".[2] Von Rad assumes that those who went with Jeremiah to Egypt were not the last ones to worship the mother goddess.[3] Von Rad thinks the same is true for the cult of the vegetation god Tammuz.[4] We know from Ezekiel that the Tammuz cult had invaded the temple shortly before Jerusalem was conquered.[5]

The fact that the prophets concentrated on the battle against the worship of Baal was due to the great influence of this deity. Very soon after the invasion the difference between Yahwe and Baal began to weaken, so that in popular Yahwism we have to reckon with a more or less complete integration of Yahwe and Baal. Yahwe was worshipped in the form of Baal. Ideas and rites of the cult

---

[1] Jeremiah 3:1ff.; Hosea 1f.

[2] Jeremiah 2; 3:1-5; 19; 3:20-4:4; 13:11; 18:15; 43:8-44:30.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 90.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ezekiel 8:14ff.

of Baal were used in the cult of Yahwe. Against this background we have to understand the tradition of the golden bull[1] and the fight of Hosea.[2] In the coming eschatological time the prophets see realized what they have proclaimed and demanded: all idolatry shall be removed, all Baalim and idols,[3] Anath and Asherah, altars and sacred pillars shall have vanished.[4]

---

[1] Exodus 32.

[2] Hosea 11:2; 8:4.

[3] Hosea 2:19; 14:4; Isaiah 30:22; Jeremiah 4:1.

[4] Hosea 3:4; 14:9; Micah 5:12f.; Isaiah 17:7-8.

PART FOUR

THE DEUTERONOMIC SYNTHESIS

PART FOUR

THE DEUTERONOMIC SYNTHESIS

The Origin of Deuteronomy and the Levites

In 722/721 B.C. the Assyrians had conquered Samaria and established the remnant of Israel as an Assyrian province, Samaria.[1] After the Israelite nobility had been deported,[2] foreign ethnical elements settled in the territory of the former state Israel, bringing their own customs and cults with them.[3] At this time we find a flow of Israelite traditions to the south, which carried the hopes of Israel that eventually Yahwe would enlarge the territory and fulfill the promise he gave to the fathers.[4] In the south the traditions of the north merged with southern Yahwistic traditions. The eventual result of this merger is the book of Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy collected the old traditions of the faith of Israel, sifting them and purifying them theologically.[5]

---

[1] Noth, Geschichte Israels, p. 237.

[2] 2 Kings 17:6,24.

[3] 2 Kings 17:29-31.

[4] Deuteronomy 19:8; 12:20.

[5] Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 37.

The spirit of Deuteronomy is zealous patriotism. It is concerned with the existence of Israel among the nations and stresses the need for a national community.[1] The traditions which constitute the particular character of Deuteronomy are the traditions which we know from the beginning of Israel: covenant, holy war, and "limited" kingship.[2] Deuteronomy in fact is one great sermon with old cultic materials worked in. All through Deuteronomy we discover small homiletic entities like warnings and promises of blessing which frame the teaching and preaching of *torah*.[3]

Although Deuteronomy does not neglect the casuistic law,[4] it strongly emphasizes the old apodictic law, which always speaks of the most heavy crimes and leaves the realm of the minor crimes undiscussed. There is no great interest in the "if" and "but" of the casuistic law. Rather we find apodictic series of laws which speak from outside into a reality to which they do not and cannot essentially apply.[5] The basic interest of Deuteronomy is directed toward the

---

[1] Deuteronomy 23:1ff.; 7:1ff.; Von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, p. 59.

[2] For the relationship between Deuteronomy and kingship see the section following on this subject.

[3] Von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg*, p. 73.

[4] Cf. Deuteronomy 21; 22.

[5] Alt, *Kleine Schriften*, II, p. 324.

national community. Deuteronomy does not reckon with a local congregation practicing law but with the whole national community to which the apodictic law is presented, and which is confronted with blessing and curse.[1] A good example in point is the great cult assembly between Ebal and Gerizim.[2] The apodictic law is presented and the whole national community is supposed to answer every curse with a loud "amen".[3]

Behind Deuteronomy stands a decidedly martial spirit.[4] Do not be afraid, but remember what Yahwe did to Egypt. You saw it with your own eyes. Thus Yahwe will do to all peoples which stand in your way.[5] Who were the people responsible for the character of Deuteronomy? We find the men responsible for the content of Deuteronomy among the Levites.[6] The emphasis on apodictic _torah_ and the warlike character of Deuteronomy points to the priests of the ark,[7] the priests of the amphictyonic

---

[1] Alt, _Kleine Schriften_, II, p. 324.

[2] Deuteronomy 27.

[3] Deuteronomy 27:15ff.

[4] Von Rad, _Studies in Deuteronomy_, p. 60.

[5] Deuteronomy 7:16ff.

[6] Von Rad, _Studies in Deuteronomy_, p. 60; cf. also Bentzen, _Introduction..._, II, p. 44.

[7] 2 Samuel 15:24.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

militia. Also we hear nothing about a Davidic covenant with its messianic consequences. Deuteronomy limits the role of the king very rigidly.[1] The men responsible for the "authorship" of Deuteronomy must have been men who had access to the old traditions and sacral materials, preserved in a rather pure form over the centuries, and they must have been priests. However, they also must have had a tremendous zeal for national and military rehabilitation.

The ark is "demythologized" and is merely a container of the tables of the law.[2] Deuteronomy reports the old right of the Levites to carry the Ark.[3] Teaching torah and carrying the ark had been the traditional rights of the Levites. The somewhat faded importance of the ark as cult object may point in the direction of north Israel. Since the north did not have the ark, the northern traditions could not reckon with it. The Yahwe name "Sabaoth" which was connected with the ark is missing also.

The northern traditions contained in Deuteronomy therefore offer as substitute for the lacking ark the שׁם theology. With the arrival of the northern traditions in

---

[1] For a discussion of this, see the following section "The Deuteronomistic View of Kingship and the Josianic Reform", later in Part Four.

[2] Deuteronomy 33:10.

[3] Deuteronomy 10:7-9; 35:3.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the south, we find a revival of this shem theology.[1] The demand for a central sanctuary is connected with the assurance that this sanctuary shall be the place where Yahwe name is dwelling.[2] The idea of the dwelling of Yahwe's name is not new.[3] Usually the expression משכן יהוה is connected with the tent of meeting.[4]

It has been said that the Levites restricted their own functions and cut off the branch on which they sat when

---

[1] Dumermuth, ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 75. Here he concludes that because of the presence of the shem theology in Jerusalem the texts which mention the ark have to be later additions. Shem theology and ark cannot live side by side (Ibid.). According to Dumermuth, the author(s) of Deuteronomy write under the experience of the exile. The ark was lost. Something had to take its place to make the ark, as symbol of Yahwe's presence, superfluous. However, Dumermuth has to admit that the shem theology could not replace the theology of the ark entirely (1 Kings 6:13; 8:27). Rather then to declare the passages mentioning the ark late and derive the superiority of the shem theology from the necessity of the loss of the ark as Dumermuth does, we suggest that we have here an incomplete blending of northern and southern traditions which both are pre-exilic. The ark theology belongs to the south and the shem theology to the north; the latter was developed to make the presence of Yahwe independent of the ark (which since Solomon stood in the temple at Jerusalem) as symbol of his presence. If the ark was already lost, which implies the destruction of Jerusalem, it is inconceivable why it was mentioned at all, especially since the שם theology offered a substitution for the ark theology.

[2] Deuteronomy 12:11,14,21; 14:23f.

[3] Jeremiah 7:12; 2 Samuel 7:5.

[4] Numbers 1:50f.; Exodus 25ff.; Numbers 3-10; 19:13; 31:30; 31:47; Leviticus 15:31; 26:11; Joshua 22:19. Most of these passages usually are counted as belonging to P. However, we may assume with some justification that P makes use here of old sacred traditions. Cf. Dumermuth, ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 65.

they demanded cultic centralization.[1] This would be true only if Deuteronomy would mean by centralization, centralization in Jerusalem. However, Deuteronomy does not intend to propose centralization at Jerusalem. The phrase "the sanctuary that Yahwe your God chooses" does not necessarily imply that this sanctuary is Jerusalem. In fact, the mention of Yahwe's choice raises a flexible and uncertain aspect about the actual place which Yahwe will choose. Furthermore, von Rad and Bentzen have emphasized that the country Levites who were living everywhere in Levitical cities were not chiefly interested in the cult.[2] We have spoken about their function as preservers and teachers of old traditions. The Shechem tradition[3] also would oppose centralization at Jerusalem because it speaks of old sacred traditions, possibly of a cultic festival between the "high places" Ebal and Gerizim, which have nothing to do with Jerusalem.[4]

Deuteronomy has to be seen in the context of a movement of restoration which possibly is influenced by a similar kind of restorative movement which was effective all over the Near East at the time of Josiah. In Egypt

---

[1] Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 67.

[2] Ibid., p. 68.

[3] Deuteronomy 27.

[4] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 325; cf. also E. Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 315ff.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

age-old cults with forgotten rituals were revived, the pyramids were rebuilt, and we discover a fondness for old forms of letters. In Babylonia Nabopolassar imitated the style of the old Babylonian kings, and his son Nebuchadnezzar excavated the foundations of old temples and claimed to have found their building documents.[1] However, this explanation is not sufficient for the purpose and origin of Deuteronomy. Political and cultic circumstances in Judah/Jerusalem after the fall of Israel are primarily responsible for the creation of Deuteronomy. The merger of northern and southern traditions were enforced through the fate of Israel and the political developments in the south. The Levites preserved the old traditions of holy war and preached the importance of Yahwe's will in the form of apodictic torah. Levites were in the south and in the north. The difference between them surely was not too great. We shall proceed by documenting the Levitical character of Deuteronomy.

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 85.

Deuteronomy and the Holy War

In a holy war it is the duty of a warrior to subject himself to the leadership of Yahwe and not to be afraid of the superior numbers of the enemies. In other words, the warrior of the holy war must have faith. This is more important than military skill.

Reading the book of Deuteronomy one is struck with the great number of laws concerning war. On the eve of battle the priest comes and prepares the army for their undertaking: fear not because Yahwe is with you, he is fighting against your enemies and shall give victory to you.[1] Those who are afraid are not allowed to fight because their fear may affect the courage of the others and turn it into fear.[2] However, the difference between holy war as revived by Deuteronomy and holy war as fought in the beginning of Israel's existence shows immediately. We hear of the siege of cities,[3] which hardly had been a feature of the ancient order of the holy war.[4] In the old times the holy war had purely defensive significance and was not used to attack cities.

---

[1] Deuteronomy 20:1-5.

[2] Deuteronomy 20:8-9.

[3] Deuteronomy 20:10-20.

[4] Von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg, p. 70.

The tradition in Deuteronomy 20:10-15 exhibits a humanitarian attitude which is difficult to combine with the fierceness of holy war. This humanitarian attitude is limited by the text to those places far from Canaan.[1] The _Sitz im Leben_ of this law is hard to discover. The attitude seems very theoretical. In the following verses[2] the true nature of holy war appears with a deuteronomic interpretation. Those people close to you shall be exterminated "so that they may not teach you to imitate all the abominable practices that they have carried on for their gods..."[3] This absolute destruction, however, is immediately limited; a beautiful woman prisoner may be taken as a wife.[4] Also, those newly wed were exempt from service in the holy war.[5]

The state of the warrior in a holy war was קדושׁ. Accordingly, the camp of men engaged in holy war should be clean because of the presence of Yahwe in the camp.[6] Holiness and ritual cleanliness belonged together. The holy state of a warrior is attested outside Deuteronomy.

---

[1] Deuteronomy 20:15.

[2] Deuteronomy 20:16-18.

[3] Deuteronomy 20:18; cf. also 25:17ff.

[4] Deuteronomy 21:10-14.

[5] Deuteronomy 24:5.

[6] Deuteronomy 23:10ff.

Warriors were consecrated to Yahwe,[1] and as long as they were engaged in holy war even the arms of warriors were holy.[2] Weapons were anointed to prepare them for holy war.[3] Everything which might offend Yahwe was put away; weapons and warriors were cleansed.[4]

Deuteronomy does not regard Israel as a number of tribes. It always speaks of Israel as a unit. Its purpose is to rebuild Israel as "kingdom of Yahwe", in other words it tries to revive the old theocratic ideal. Israel is the עם קדוש, which means a nation consecrated to Yahwe,[5] and this determines the life of Israel. Many of the laws in Deuteronomy are legitimated and achieve their importance through this assurance: "... for you are a people consecrated to Yahwe."[6] That it is a people of Yahwe is Israel's praise, renown, and honor.[7] The עם קדוש is realized most when Israel and Yahwe are in the same camp and when Yahwe fights for his people. The term עם קדוש is a term of the holy war.

---

[1] Isaiah 13:3; Jeremiah 22:7; 51:27f.

[2] 1 Samuel 21:5; Jeremiah 22:7.

[3] 2 Samuel 1:21; Isaiah 21:5.

[4] Deuteronomy 23:14.

[5] Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2.

[6] Deuteronomy 14:21.

[7] Deuteronomy 26:19.

Israel's existence as a "holy nation" places responsibility on it to fulfill the law of Yahwe, which is extermination of other peoples who could separate it from Yahwe. Israel constantly is brought in contact with other peoples and judgment is passed upon them.[1] The laws in Deuteronomy stand in a warlike atmosphere. Its eyes are constantly directed toward enemies and Deuteronomy is always conscious of their presence.[2]

In our previous discussion of holy war we said that the ark and the name Yahwe Sabaoth were closely connected with holy war. The name Yahwe Sabaoth, strangely, is not mentioned in Deuteronomy. This may be connected with the demythologization of the ark and because it was a southern name for Yahwe. The _shem_ theology prohibited in fact the use of a name of Yahwe which was connected with the original significance of the ark. The ark had been a symbol of the presence of Yahwe Sabaoth. Now the ark was a container of the tablets of the _torah_. This means that the ark was no longer the place where Yahwe revealed himself. The ark was stripped of its cultic significance. This certainly is connected with the role of the _shem_ theology, which says that Yahwe dwells in heaven[3] and

---

[1] Deuteronomy 8:20; 12:2; 15:6; 18:9,14; 23:20; 25:19; 26:19, etc.

[2] Von Rad, _Der Heilige Krieg_, p. 67. Deuteronomy 6:18; 7:1ff.; 11:23ff.; 12:29; 19:1; 20:16f.

[3] Deuteronomy 4:36.

"only" his name is present at the sanctuary which he will choose. However, it is strange that in the passage about the camp of the holy war Yahwe is thought of as coming into the camp of the holy war. Apparently the old tradition dominates here.[1] The camp of the holy war actually is the sanctuary, a concentration of the holy people, so to speak. Revelation of Yahwe can now happen at any place Yahwe chooses.

When the kings secularized the army system during the development of the monarchy, thus abandoning holy war and dismissing the Levites from their role as priests of the holy war, the old significance of the militia disappeared also. As we have seen, the prophets tried to regain the realm of politics for Yahwe by preaching that Yahwe Sabaoth, the leader in holy war, was Lord of history. Yahwe Sabaoth was the only chance for Israel's survival.

After defeating the Egyptian Pharaoh, Sennacherib turned against the rebels in Palestine. He quickly defeated the Philistines and then conquered Judah. Jerusalem was enclosed by Assyrian troops. Hezekiah had no alternative but surrender. He had to pay an enormous sum of tribute to Sennacherib.[2] Very suddenly then the strength of the Neo-Assyrian empire was broken. Assurbanipal was a scholar

---

[1] Von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg, p. 70.

[2] 2 Kings 18:14f.

but not a conqueror. In 625 Babylonia made herself independent under her own king. This was the time of restoration for the subdued kingships. Judah participated in this restoration, particularly under Josiah, who made use of the temporary weakness of the Mesopotamian foes.

It is our hypothesis that the enormous tribute which Hezekiah had to pay apparently had exhausted the financial capacity of Judah completely. The mercenary troops had been surrendered to the Assyrian king.[1] If there was to be any military activity in Judah the population capable of bearing arms had to be called for military service. This meant a revival of the old militia system. עם הארץ had been the designation of the amphictyonic militia.[2] That even in Judah the secularization had not been able to eliminate the עם הארץ completely is evident in the events of 2 Kings 11:17; 21:24. The clique of traitors was set aside and the עם הארץ exercised their power to install the legitimate successor to the throne.[3]

It is not accidental that at these two times we hear about a covenant according to the amphictyonic pattern

---

[1] Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 60. Hezekiah's successors Manasseh and Amon did not engage in any military activities. Manasseh was a loyal vassal of the Assyrians all his life.

[2] Judges 5:11; 20:2; 2 Samuel 1:12; Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 63.

[3] 2 Kings 11:20.

in Judah. These are the only times after the covenant between David and Israel[1] that such a covenant occurs in the south. The powers behind the עם הארץ movement were the Levites of the country.[2] They preserved the old traditions, among them the covenant traditions.[3] The activity of the Levites in these events explains the double character of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy is a combination of a martial and a priestly spirit.[4] The revival of the holy war was a national and religious necessity. Josiah made use of the militia because his pockets were empty. Together with the militia the Levites arose, reviving the old Yahwe faith. They preached apodictic law and the holy war; they were against idolatry and advocated theocracy.

---

[1] 2 Samuel 5:1-3.

[2] Deuteronomy 12:12,18f.; 14:27,29; 16:11ff.; 26:12.

[3] Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 66.

[4] Ibid.

The Relationship Between Deuteronomy and the Prophets

Deuteronomy shows a great interest in the prophetic movement. For Deuteronomy the prophets are the central "office" through which the relationship and communication with Yahwe is held open. Therefore it is important for Yahwe to raise up prophets from time to time among the Israelites.[1] Deuteronomy offers a whole law for prophets, regulating their position. When a prophet delivers an oracle in the name of Yahwe which Yahwe did not command him to deliver, that prophet shall die.[2] The criterion by which the _dabar_ of a prophet can be recognized as a true _dabar_ is its fulfillment unless it forms a seduction to serve alien gods.[3] In Deuteronomy we experience a generalization of the _dabar_. Deuteronomy uses this term still in the old sense to denote either a prophetic _dabar_ or _torah_. The difference between these two meanings of _dabar_, however, is removed in Deuteronomy. _Dabar_ in Deuteronomy very generally means the _dabar_ of revelation of Yahwe.[4]

---

[1] Deuteronomy 18:18.

[2] Deuteronomy 18:20.

[3] Deuteronomy 18:22; 13:1-3.

[4] Grether, _op_. _cit_., p. 120.

The position of Moses in Deuteronomy added to this generalization. Moses is a prophet, the first prophet. In his person, so to speak, the two forms of dabar of Yahwe are united. According to the order of Deuteronomy, prophets will be the mediators of the dabar after Moses and throughout history. This is the meaning of "from time to time I will raise a prophet". The succession of prophets guarantees communication between Yahwe and Israel. At the same time Deuteronomy regulates the prophets. Through the criterion of the fulfillment of a prophetic dabar, Deuteronomy distinguished itself from the "great" prophets. Israel did not need to be afraid when a prophecy was not fulfilled. Von Rad is right when he says that Deuteronomy tries to protect the people from the prophets. There are prophets who bother the people.[1]

The law for the prophets in Deuteronomy 18 also reveals something else. The prophet, according to Deuteronomy, was not a free individual. Prophetism became something institutional through the succession "from time to time". The prophet was a mediator. His functions were described. One of the cultic functions of the prophets is re-emphasized: to intercede on behalf of the people.[2]

---

[1] Von Rad, ZAW, LXIII (1951), p. 113.

[2] Ibid., p. 114.

These facts still do not justify the designation "cult prophets" for those prophets who fit the description of Deuteronomy. Certainly, however, it is true that Deuteronomy, by adjusting the prophets to its purpose, national revival, broke their revolutionary strength. This strength had had a negative effect on the people and it was the purpose of the prophetic law of Deuteronomy to remove this "negative" influence.

The deuteronomic adjustment may have been the problem of Jeremiah and the reason why he, among all prophets, was faced with the problem of prophetic authority.[1] He stood outside, was bothersome, tried to intercede for his people, and still had to pronounce judgment. Deuteronomy had set the goal and thus the limit of prophetic

---

[1] Two passages in Jeremiah are thought to refer to Deuteronomy. The first of thepassages in canonical order is 8:8. John Skinner, Prophecy and Religion (Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press, 1922), pp. 104-5, considers the passage as a proclamation against Deuteronomy. The original Deuteronomy had been overlaid by scribal additions and had lost its value as an ethical standard. Because Deuteronomy had fallen into the hands of the professionals who had perverted it, Jeremiah condemns Deuteronomy root and branch. Adam C. Welch, Jeremiah, His Time and His Work (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), p. 92, in general agrees with Skinner as he says the priesthood in Jerusalem perverted Deuteronomy and made it an addition to their regulations. P. Volz, Der Prophet Jeremia (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1928), pp. 76-77 and Weiser, Der Prophet Jeremia, p. 78, find no reference to Deuteronomy in 8:8. They interpret torah as meaning torah in general. Here in 8:8 we find the same accusation against priests and prophets which the prophet had voiced in 2:8 (thus Volz) or in 7:21ff. (thus Weiser). Weiser considers as opposites the dabar of Yahwe and the written torah. This written torah means for Weiser all

sacrificial laws, while the *dabar* of Yahwe means the covenantal tradition. The whole written sacrificial *torah* is considered a *torah* of lies by Jeremiah. In other words, Weiser suggests that Jeremiah does not condemn the whole Deuteronomy, but only the sacrificial *torah* contained in it. This separation of *torah* from *torah* is artificial and in no way justified by Jeremiah 8:8 (cf. the discussion of 8:8 in the following paragraphs).

One problem for the interpretation of the passage is the date of authorship, about which we know nothing. Skinner, *op. cit.*, p. 104, merely asserts that this passage is considerably later than the second passage, which perhaps is concerned with Deuteronomy 11:1ff.

Jeremiah 11:1-14 depicts the prophet Jeremiah as a propagandist for Deuteronomy. Volz (p. 130) says this is impossible because the passage does not at all refer to the Deuteronomy covenant but to the Sinai covenant. The term דברי הברית, according to Volz, designates the Sinai covenant (v.3b). Duhm and Cornill declare the whole passage as non-Jeremianic (cf. Volz, p. 130). Skinner accepts 11:1-14 as proof for the sympathy of Jeremiah toward Deuteronomy (cf. pp. 100-102). He rejects the possibility of reference to the Sinai covenant on the basis of deuteronomic terminology in vv. 4-5. Another way to establish the deuteronomic character of the passage would be to delete, on the basis of the Septuagint text, all allusions to the Sinai covenant (cf. Erbt in Welch, *Jeremiah...*, p. 94). Weiser, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, pp. 100-101, assumes the presence of true words of Jeremiah which were transformed by the liturgical tradition of the cult community. The original words cannot be extracted but the "I" in vv. 5,9,14 seems to reveal some of the original form of Jeremiah's words. Weiser continues and bases the passage on the covenantal feast in Jerusalem. According to Weiser, this is supported by vv. 2,15, and the reference to the covenantal people Israel and Judah in vv. 10,17. Jeremiah stands on the ground of the Sinai covenant which for Weiser is a sign for the Jeremianic character of the prophetic tradition contained in 11:1-13.

The question which should be asked is: is it possible in the time of Jeremiah to speak of covenant and the words of the covenant without referring to Deuteronomy? The code was a reality for some time when Jeremiah appeared on the scene. It seems natural for a man who stood on the old covenant to greet a new emphasis on this symbol for the relationship between Yahwe and Israel. We agree with Weiser that 11:1-13 certainly does not represent the original form in which these words were spoken, but that prophetic words form the basis of them. The reference to Israel and Judah makes sense only against the background of the deuteronomic pan-Israelism. For Deuteronomy the whole people was involved, even those who for some time were separated from free

activity. Jeremiah was a victim of the deuteronomic law for the prophet because he did not fulfill the requirements. If Deuteronomy tried to make relevant for its time the pre-state orders and laws, in other words revive the old Yahwistic traditions, it had to battle the prophetic judgment that all those laws meant judgment because Israel had forsaken Yahwe, the giver of torah. For the prophets the covenant was broken, which means that the relationship with Yahwe was interrupted. Yahwe would punish the people for their idolatry. The remnant was the most optimistic thing the prophets had to say about a possibility of salvation besides the new "creation" which assumed an end of the old.

Deuteronomy propagates continuity, even for the prophets. The true "church" had incorporated the "heretics",

---

"Israel" (Judah). Further, we agree with Weiser that we find liturgical tones in 11:1-5: the affirmation of the congregation in Deuteronomy 27 and the content (curses, promise of the country) shows familiarity with 11:1-5. Therefore we suggest that 11:1-13 suggests an initial positive attitude of Jeremiah toward Deuteronomy. For the prophet and the people Deuteronomy was nothing new; it was a re-affirmation of the Sinai covenant. However, the positive attitude of Jeremiah toward Deuteronomy did not last long. Jeremiah 8:8 shows us that the renewal of the covenant did not help much. Official religion got hold of Deuteronomy and it became only another document of assurance that Yahwe was with his people. As the "first" torah had been perverted into a cultic means of proclaiming security through Yahwe (and from Yahwe), thus Deuteronomy furnished precisely the same purposes. The prophet did not attack Deuteronomy as such, but attacked the interpretation and realization of Deuteronomy as other prophets before him had attacked the interpretation and realiaation of torah. The priests lie about the significance of Deuteronomy and torah because they do not open themselves and the people to the full impact of the law of Yahwe.

had prescribed their function, and thus limited them and made them ineffective. It is not accidental that Deuteronomy considers it necessary to adopt the election (bachar) covenant[1] of the Jerusalem tradition. This lopsided arrangement, which put the whole responsibility of the relationship between Yahwe and Israel on Yahwe, was Deuteronomy's possibility of salvation. Even Deuteronomy knew that the old covenant was not a covenant any longer.[2] Yahwe's word had been fulfilled in history. According to Deuteronomy, Yahwe's word, once spoken, reached its goal by virtue of the power inherent in it. This can be traced as a theological scheme all through the deuteronomic work of history.[3]

We find certain relationships between the messages of the prophets and the viewpoints represented by Deuteronomy. For example, Hosea proclaims that the monarchy, with everything belonging to it, has to disappear out of Israel so that the relationship between Yahwe and Israel

---

[1] See the above pages 192-195.

[2] Perhaps it was not even aware of the difference between *bachar* covenant and the "old" covenant, although the events of 2 Kings 11 and 23 testify to the opposite. Possibly the adoption of the *bachar* covenant shows some priestly realism.

[3] Von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, p. 79.

Prophecy:		Fulfillment:
2 Samuel 7:13.		1 Kings 8:20.
1 Kings 11:29ff.		1 Kings 12:15b.
1 Kings 13.		1 Kings 23:16-18, etc.

can be re-established.[1] Hosea surpasses Deuteronomy in the radicality of his demand but the demands of Deuteronomy certainly lie on the same line.[2] Deuteronomy is related to the southern prophets in its social demands. The prophets launched accusations against the leading circles. Deuteronomy does not explicitly report the existence of these leading circles, but always speaks to the whole national community.[3]

Again a similarity between Deuteronomy and Hosea shows in the terminology concerning the relationship between Yahwe and Israel. Yahwe loves Israel and Israel will be destroyed if it forsakes this love. However, the love will not cease because Yahwe will not surrender his love. The word "love" for the relationship between Yahwe and Israel is unusual and its usage in both Deuteronomy and Hosea shows Hosea's influence on Deuteronomy.[4] Basically one may say that the radical demands of the prophets are softened in Deuteronomy when we have a similarity of demand. This fact goes back to what we said before, that Deuteronomy tries to protect the people from the bothersome prophets without, however, rejecting the prophetic message.

---

[1] Hosea 1:4f.; 7:3ff.; 8:4,10; 10:3; 13:11.

[2] See the section below on Deuteronomy and the kingship.

[3] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 268.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 272f.

The dabar as revelation of Yahwe is torah and prophetic dabar. That Moses with whom torah is closely associated is called a prophet, unites Levites as champions of torah with the representatives of "free" revelation, the prophets. However, tradition proved to be stronger. The "free" revelation had to be channeled, and that meant the end of true prophetism.[1]

---

[1] Actually Deuteronomy is an anti-prophetic book. Incorporating prophetism into official religion made prophetism ineffective. This is a rule which can be traced all through the history of the Christian church. If the institution is powerful enough and flexible enough, heresies are never a danger. Today it can be observed that the closer the word of a preacher is to a prophetic word, especially one with a critical effect, the more the "audience" "enjoys" it. The faith in the judgment of God as eschatological reality is gone. We must say it is absorbed by official religion, which has an assurance for every disturbance. The cult in Old Testament times preached "peace, peace", even if there was no peace, and it was clear that danger was threatening. Is it true that human favor builds the strength of God? Or is cult or official religion really God because it pretends to serve God while it actually administers the unknown? This could pose a threat, knowing that cult or official religion have really caught the people in rites and rituals which are presented as though they have power in themselves. In other words the cult protects man from a divine threat which it knows does not exist. The true cynics always are the representatives of cultic religion although on the surface it seems that the prophetic voices are cynical.

In order to use a picture for the relationship between cult and prophet at the time of Jeremiah or between official religion and heresy (which usually is genuine criticism): cult and official religion are like an ocean in which even the most powerful wave, which would destroy everything in its way if it would find resistance, can roll out quietly without finding anything to break upon. The wave we would liken to heresy or prophetism during the time of Jeremiah. For church history, Augustine would be a good example. He was accepted by the church although according to the content of his teachings he was a heretic. This was documented after his death when semi-Pelagianism became a sort of Augustinism with official consent of the church. It

The Deuteronomic Version of the Covenant

The period in the wilderness had been the best. Israel's dependence upon Yahwe was then greatest. The situation changed when Israel settled in the land which was flowing with milk and honey. Israel accepted the gift and deserted the giver. Jeshurun grew fat and forsook "God who had made them and scoffed at the rock of their salvation."[1] The covenant was broken. Israel served alien gods.[2] In spite of this situation Deuteronomy had to make very positive statements about Israel's relationship to Yahwe. Yahwe had chosen Israel out of all people to be his own סגלה.[3]

The usage of the term סגלה is almost exclusive in Deuteronomy.[4] Outside Deuteronomy it appears only three times.[5] The term סגלה corresponds to the term

---

is not accidental that later heretics, especially the reformers, were able to stand on Augustine and at the same time be against the official church. In Jeremiah's case the story is more pitiful. He was limited by the prophetic law of Deuteronomy. This meant that he had to fit what was prescribed, or his words would have no authority. And this all on the basis of a work which basically was a good and genuine renewal of Yahwism and the covenantal relationship.

[1] Deuteronomy 32:15.

[2] Deuteronomy 32:16f.

[3] Deuteronomy 14:2.

[4] Staerk, ZAW, LV (1937), p. 8.

[5] Exodus 19:5; Psalm 135:4; Malachi 3:17. The latter passage speaks about the eschatological community.

עם קדוש which we already discussed as a possible name for the people engaged in a holy war. Both terms express a theology which seems to have overcome the disruption of the covenant and emphasize a new type of relationship between Yahwe and Israel.

The covenantal term in Deuteronomy is בחר. *Bachar* was a word of royal ideology. Yahwe had "chosen" the house of David and its individual members. The term *bachar*, already formulated and with the content of the royal covenant, was adopted by Deuteronomy to express a new reality. We find the same features as in the royal *bachar* theology, only that they are now spoken not of one man or the house of David but of the whole people. *Bachar* is a term of salvation, of sure salvation; this is in contrast to the covenant, which denotes a relationship of mutual responsibilities. In a *bachar* relationship the responsibilities are not emphasized, or perhaps one should say that only Yahwe's responsibility is of importance.

Bachar is an expression of the everlasting covenant Yahwe made with the house of David.[1] This "covenant" has no legal foundation but is based on the mercy and the love of Yahwe. However, Deuteronomy did something to the royal *bachar* ideology. When it seemed that the everlastingness of Yahwe's "covenant" with David lifted the institution of

---

[1] 2 Samuel 7:16.

the monarchy out of the changing mood of human history, Deuteronomy put this bachar relationship between Yahwe and Israel actively at work in history. This means that this relationship was not so much a cultic relationship as a historical one. The election of the king constituted shalom for his people and thus necessarily meant victory in his political engagements. However, Dauteronomy emphasizes the servant role of Israel in history much more than the royal ideology. The bachar relationship between Yahwe and Israel is much more determined by a purpose. The militant spirit in Deuteronomy clearly attests this purpose: removal of all idols,[1] worship at one sanctuary,[2] and extermination of the people living in the country which Yahwe would give to Israel.[3]

The bachar relationship in Deuteronomy has the historical foundation which the covenant usually had. The liberation out of Egypt now is the great deed of Yahwe. This was the time when Yahwe chose (bachar) Israel.[4] Never before have we heard the exodus event mentioned as constituting the relationship between Yahwe and his chosen one. The royal ideology in Jerusalem understood bachar as cultic

---

[1] Deuteronomy 12:2f.

[2] Deuteronomy 12:5.

[3] Deuteronomy 12:29f.

[4] Deuteronomy 9:26; 11:4; 16:3,12; 7:6-8, etc.

event in contrast to the covenant. Deuteronomy created a peculiar theology of salvation by means of the bachar relationship, which was royal cult tradition of Jerusalem, and merged it with elements of the old covenantal tradition.

The dynasty of David was chosen to be a guarantee for the continuation of shalom among its people. Deuteronomy transforms this idea also. Seemingly it goes back to true Yahwistic traditions by giving the prophet national status. As we have seen, this institutionalization of the prophets meant the end of the revolutionary strength inherent in the prophets. Now in Deuteronomy they are no longer spokesmen of opposition and doom. The promise that Yahwe would raise a prophet in Israel from time to time meant a guarantee of the continuation of the presence of Yahwe's dabar. And this of course meant not doom as originally the dabar meant, as it confronted a faithless people with the will of Yahwe, but instead signified salvation.

The cultic and authoritative character of the kingship was surrendered in favor of the old Yahwistic traditions. The continuity of the kingship no longer was the means of salvation. Continuity of kingship was substituted with continuity of prophets. The kingship no longer was chosen, but all Israel was chosen instead. Northern and southern traditions merged to make this bachar relationship possible. The north furnished tradition of a relationship between

Yahwe and Israel, the covenant, and limitation of the kingship; the south contributed the bachar covenant and the necessity of continuation.

One difficulty remains to be cleared up. We have a historical note about a covenant in 2 Kings 23.[1] What kind of covenant do we find here? Who are the partners in this covenant? The closest parallel seems to be in Joshua 24. Here also we do not know between whom the covenant is concluded. According to what we have said about the deuteronomic character of the covenant, we expect the partners in Joshua 24 to be Yahwe and the people. However, this does not seem to be true for 2 Kings 23 and 11 also. Taking the words of 2 Kings 23 literally, we hear only about a covenant between Josiah and the people before the Lord, which means only Yahwe is witness, and the covenant is concluded in the temple. The עם הארץ had brought Josiah into power and apparently Josiah felt obligated to those עם הארץ. This certainly was not because of great love for them but because he would continue to need them.

We know that Josiah was dependent upon the עם הארץ for his military enterprises. They were the militia, the only military force available to Josiah. The king called together the elders of Judah and Jerusalem.[2] The elders

---

[1] Cf. also 2 Kings 11.

[2] Jerusalem certainly is a deuteronomic addition because Deuteronomy propagates the unity of Israel, and Jerusalem was thus already included.

[illegible]

[illegible] ψυχή [illegible]

[illegible] ψυχῆς. [illegible]

[illegible] ψυχή [illegible]

[illegible]

were called together to make a covenant with king Josiah. The text says that the king had to take his oath on the decrees and commands which were in the book which was found. That cannot mean anything else but that Josiah agreed to the role which Deuteronomy prescribed for the king: he was the official of Yahwe.

Having taken this oath, Josiah made a covenant with the people. This covenant, and here we have to disagree with Noth,[1] certainly has no parallel in Joshua 24, but is similar to 1 Samuel 5:3, where David made a covenant between himself and Israel. Josiah thus gave up basic rights acquired by the kings of the house of David since Solomon. This was possible because of Josiah's dependency upon military support of the עם הארץ.[2]

---

[1] Noth, *Gesammelte Studien*, pp. 61ff.

[2] The first time the עם הארץ had intervened in favor of a Davidic king was when they protected Joash against Athaliah and established him as their king. Because of this support the king made a covenant with them. The result was the removal of idols and images (cf. 2 Kings 11:17ff.). The עם הארץ, however, did not have the same power as they had in the Josiah event. The relationship between עם הארץ and king did not last. The successors of Joash did not need the support of the עם הארץ and the old pre-Joash situation continued as the kings based their military strength upon the proved ability of mercenaries.

The Deuteronomic Law

Is Deuteronomy really law as the name suggests? Klostermann was the first to suggest that Deuteronomy is not only a "book of law", but also a collection of materials used in the public interpretation or preaching of the law.[1] Deuteronomy shows a resemblance to the Book of the Covenant.[2] The major difference between the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy lies in the form of both. The Book of the Covenant is law in a codified form, while Deuteronomy is law in parenetical form. The basic theme of the parenesis is the uniqueness of Israel among the nations. This uniqueness is manifest in the will of Yahwe, who has chosen just this people not because of Israel's quality, but because Yahwe had set his heart on it.[3] A good example of the homiletic method of Deuteronomy is the law for slaves.[4] In vv. 12 and 16ff. the Deuteronomist quotes the same law according to the Book of the Covenant,[5] and continues with a homily. The change in style is remarkable. The Deuteronomist changes the old objective casuistic style of Exodus 21 into a speech of

---

[1] Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 15.

[2] Exodus 21.

[3] Deuteronomy 4:6-8; 7:7.

[4] Deuteronomy 15:12-18.

[5] Exodus 21:2 and 5f.

Moses to Israel.[1]

Deuteronomy combines the two styles of law freely. Casuistic and apodictic forms of law stand side by side.[2] The "you", foreign to the casuistic form, appears suddenly. In Deuteronomy 27 the apodictic sentences form the core of a national cultic celebration, presented to the people by the "preachers" of the law of Yahwe, the Levites.[3] This double character of Deuteronomy may be due to the double tradition; it is both priestly and civil.[4] The priestly or Levite tradition is responsible for the apodictic laws; the elders are responsible for casuistic laws. One was holy law and the other was "civil" law.

We can also observe that the apodictic law is far removed from daily life. Its Sitz im Leben is quite different from that of the casuistic laws, which are much more apt to regulate the daily legal needs of the people.[5] We may say that the apodictic law finds its interpretation in the casuistic law. Both have the same content, although the former appears with much greater force. It is Yahwe himself standing behind his will. When Deuteronomy preaches

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 287.

[2] Deuteronomy 19:16-21. [3] Deuteronomy 33:10.

[4] Alt, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 326; Deuteronomy 31:9-13.

[5] Ibid.

its major theme, the separation of Israel from other nations and the exclusive relationship with Yahwe, it usually uses the forceful language of the apodictic law.[1]

The recipient of the Levitical parenesis is Israel. That means that the Levites understand the original cult community as the receiver of Yahwe's will.[2] The usage of the name "Israel", rather than the names of the actual tribal groups present at the preaching of the law at different occasions, clearly reflects the viewpoint of Deuteronomy: it is the whole Israel which Yahwe wants. This Israel is the worshipping community rather than a political entity, although sometimes one has the impression that Deuteronomy removes the differences between the worshipping Israel and the fighting Israel.[3]

---

[1] Deuteronomy 6:4ff.; 23:2ff.

[2] Deuteronomy 6:4; 4:1; 5:1; 9:1; 20:3; 22:21.

[3] See the previous section on holy war.

The Deuteronomistic View of Kingship and the Josianic Reform

Among the laws of the Old Testament we find almost nothing about the kingship or about anything which could be considered "regulations for the king". We hear a negative description of what a king will do.[1] The king stands outside all laws which Yahwe had given to the tribes.[2] The only attempt to include the monarchy into the order of the people is found in Deuteronomy. However, this attempt failed, as the content of the "law of the king" in Deuteronomy shows.[3]

The deuteronomistic work of history joins in with the stereotype judgment that a king had not followed the ordinances, commandments, and statutes of Yahwe. Positive instructions for the life of the people have never originated from the kingship, neither in the realm of warfare nor in the realm of law.[4] The kingship is not genuinely Israelite; it is adopted from other peoples.[5] When we consider the relationship between Israel and other nations,

---

[1] 1 Samuel 8:11f.

[2] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 116.

[3] Deuteronomy 17:14ff.

[4] Deuteronomy 20; 23:10ff.; 16:18ff.; 17:2ff., etc.

[5] Deuteronomy 17:14; 1 Samuel 8:5.

this judgment on the kingship becomes even more severe. Deuteronomy 17:15b-17 offers negative regulations about the duties of the king. The only positive regulation is that the king should keep out of everything which could disturb the order of Israel's life. That means that Deuteronomy does not give a complete "yes" or "no" to the question of the kingship.

The king is the one whom Yahwe will choose.[1] This idea certainly refers to Yahwe's free choice of the charismatic king. Josiah may have interpreted this idea however as referring to Yahwe's covenant with David.[2] In this sense Josiah could understand himself as legitimated in the eyes of Deuteronomy. The deuteronomistic work of history has a more explicitly favorable attitude toward David. Here we find the idealization of David. He is the ideal king, for he fulfills the conditions of Deuteronomy. He is chosen by Yahwe through a prophet. David hardly has been subjected to a historical investigation. He is understood as a charismatic king. In spite of the circumstances of his ascension to the throne and the sins of his life, he is the ideal. The deuteronomic judgment becomes effective here. Good is the one whom history proved good. In other words, the success of a king proves that Yahwe was with

---

[1] Deuteronomy 17:15.

[2] Deuteronomy 17:20.

him. The fact that other kings also have been successful does not have any weight. Measured with the success of David they were all minor. Thus we have at least to reckon with the possibility that Deuteronomy assumes the ideal king to be a member of the house of David although Deuteronomy itself does not say this explicitly.

The one whom Yahwe will choose points rather in the direction of the charismatic kingship, where the continuity is not a matter of dynasty but of the mobile will of Yahwe who chooses whom and where he wants. It is clear that Deuteronomy 17 restricts the position of the king and makes him almost superfluous. This reminds us of the attitude of Hosea. Hosea criticizes the reigning monarch on the basis of the charismatic ideal and proceeds even further in his expectations of the future. The kingship has to disappear out of Israel because only then can the people regain their original relationship with Yahwe.[1] This radical "no" to the institution of the kingship certainly exceeds the attitude of Deuteronomy but we cannot overlook the fact that they both stand on the same line.[2]

The attitude of Deuteronomy may have been softened by the attitude taken by the southern prophets, the authors of late passages in the books of Isaiah and Micah. They

---

[1] Hosea 1:4f.; 7:3ff.; 8:4,10; 10:3; 13:11.

[2] Alt, *Kleine Schriften*, II, p. 267.

expected the Davidic dynasty to continue in their expectation of salvation. However, as we have seen in the discussion of Isaiah, this prophet re-adjusts the kingship in Jerusalem to the old traditions of the holy war and propagates the kingship of Yahwe more than he does the kingship in Jerusalem.[1]

Josiah was an active and ambitious king. It is hard to believe that he was satisfied with the position which Deuteronomy 17 prescribed for him. It is true that in his covenant with the elders Josiah had subjected himself to the conditions of Deuteronomy, but very soon his use of the laws and regulations of Deuteronomy branched off the original intention of Deuteronomy. Apparently other motives than the realization of a theocracy determined the actions of Josiah. Our tradition only speaks of the reforms of the cultic realm and excludes the other realms of life, which according to Deuteronomy are subject to a certain order.[2] We hear about the celebration of the Passover feast in Jerusalem. Until then this feast had been celebrated by each family individually.[3] Thus we find here a radical break with this ancient tradition.

This renovation seems to concur with the demand for

---

[1] Isaiah 7:2-17. Possibly this is the only passage in Isaiah which does not refer to the future messianic king as a member of the house of David.

[2] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 252.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

centralization. Even this "centralization" seems a doubtful interpretation of the verse "the sanctuary which the Lord your God chooses out of all your tribes as seat of his presence..."[1] Considering the mobile character of Yahwe in old times, when the ark was the symbol of Yahwe's presence among his people, it seems at least possible that Deuteronomy has the same in mind: a temporary location where Yahwe will put his name. This may be any one of the old amphictyonic sanctuaries in the country. Not considering the ark which was in Jerusalem, Deuteronomy 27 strongly suggests Shechem as a point of Yahwe-service. Shechem never had anything to do with the ark, which would be a recommendation for Deuteronomy since it does not emphasize the role of the ark.[2]

We are not sure whether Josiah ever attempted to execute the laws and regulations prescribed and demanded by Deuteronomy. It is true that he fulfilled the deuteronomic demand for the removal of all foreign deities and the demand for cultic centralization. But Josiah over-fulfilled (certainly in his own interests) the demands when he removed the Yahwe sanctuaries in Israel together with the cult places of foreign deities. Very soon there must have been opposition to the execution of deuteronomic demands.

---

[1] Deuteronomy 12:5.

[2] E. Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 335f., 341f.

This opposition stemmed from the priesthood in Jerusalem, which did not want to share its authority with anyone else.[1] Deuteronomy had made provisions for the Levites which made them equal to the Zadokite priests.[2] Again and again we meet provisions for the needs of the Levites. Israel shall have mercy on the Levite, who is mentioned in the same category with orphans and widows.[3]

Josiah had Deuteronomy in his hands and he used it to his advantage and for his political purposes. We have already discussed the covenant between Josiah and the elders which secured him the military following of the עם הארץ. Deuteronomy lauds the removal of all idols and "foreign" sanctuaries. We are not sure whether this is due to the demand of Deuteronomy or whether it is triggered at least as much by the political events. When Assyria weakened, Josiah removed the Assyrian idols, which were symbols of Judah's state of vassalship, from the temple.[4]

After thus freeing his people from foreign sovereignty, Josiah tried to build up his kingdom. One of the political necessities was a rigid centralization of the cult. David had used this means to bind the people of

---

[1] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 256.

[2] Deuteronomy 17:8-13; 18:1-8, etc.

[3] Deuteronomy 12:12, 18f.; 16:11,14, etc.

[4] Noth, Gesammelte Studien, p. 60.

Israel to Jerusalem and had been successful. Josiah tried to do the same, only more radically. The seeming justification for the removal of all sanctuaries except Jerusalem was found by Josiah in Deuteronomy, as he interpreted the passage mentioned above, "...the sanctuary which the Lord your God chooses", to mean his capital Jerusalem.

The king removed all priests of Yahwe (sic!) from all the places of Judah and brought them into his capital.[1] The destruction of all Yahwistic sanctuaries followed. This was not true for Judah only. Joshua 21 and 1 Chronicles 6:39ff. render a list of cities in which members of the Levitical priesthood could live with special rights.[2] This list does not mention any place in the region of Judah but does mention cities in the northern environment of Jerusalem, that means in the territory of the city state of Jerusalem.[3] The events of the destruction of Bethel[4] probably belong in this time.[5]

The enumeration in 2 Kings 23 confirms that of the Levitical cities in Joshua 21. This time there is a gap reaching from Bethel in the south to the northern edge

---

[1] 2 Kings 23:8a.

[2] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 258.

[3] Ibid., p. 259.

[4] 1 Kings 13:2.

[5] Alt, Kleine Schriften, II, p. 260.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

of the Assyrian province Samaria. Josiah apparently exterminated all Yahwe priests in this territory. This action certainly went far beyond the scope of Deuteronomy. The reason for the radicality of Josiah probably is the resistance of the northern Yahwe priests against an annexation which would put them in the kingdom of a member of the house of David. They also rejected all royal influence on the sanctuaries. Deuteronomy seemed to give a slight legitimation to these actions of Josiah. In reality he went far beyond the regulations and demands of Deuteronomy and certainly did not understand his position as a king in the way in which Deuteronomy prescribed it.[1]

---

[1] It is interesting to speculate what judgment Deuteronomy would have had on Josiah if he had not died so soon. One is almost certain that he would have been rejected as one who usurped rights which an official of Yahwe did not have.

Deuteronomy and the Temple in Jerusalem

We have tried to show that Deuteronomy is to be understood as a book of predominantly northern origin with southern elements in it. The southern elements served to adjust realistically - in a theological way - the radical demands of northern circles. This is true for the covenant which had, according to the prophetic proclamations and Levitical *torah*, been broken. Still Deuteronomy proclaimed the covenant, but in a form which corresponded to the realistic situation of the relationship between Yahwe and Israel. It *had* to be Yahwe's doing alone and his responsibility alone if there was to be a chance for Israel. Thus Deuteronomy adopted the *bachar* ideology, at home in the Jerusalem temple, which does not speak of mutual responsibility but of Yahwe's election of Israel.

The northern influence is clearly visible in Deuteronomy's attitude toward the kingship. The revival of the holy war certainly points to the Levites as those mainly responsible for Deuteronomy. This is supported by the old tradition, the apodictic *torah*, which finds a revival in Deuteronomy. On this background we must understand Deuteronomy's idea of the central cult place.

> "...to the sanctuary which the Lord your God chooses out of all your tribes as the seat of his presence, to his habitation you must resort; there you must go..."[1]

Frequently this verse has been understood to point to Jerusalem as the central sanctuary.[2] At the place which Yahwe will choose, he will let his name dwell.[3] This place will be the axis around which the whole cultic life of Israel shall revolve.[4] If there is a case of law the people must go to this sanctuary.[5] The great feasts of Israel shall be celebrated here.[6] At the end of every seven years the people shall listen to the reading of torah.[7] Nowhere is a particular sanctuary mentioned by name. Always the same formula is repeated: the sanctuary which Yahwe will choose.

One has the impression that the Deuteronomist may have no specific sanctuary in mind. This is supported by the fiction of letting Moses speak, thus putting the choice of the sanctuary into the future. The sanctuary is to be located in the territory of "one of your tribes". If this

---

[1] Deuteronomy 12:5.

[2] Staerk, ZAW, LV (1937), p. 25.

[3] Deuteronomy 12:11,21.

[4] Deuteronomy 12:12.

[5] Deuteronomy 17:8,10.

[6] Deuteronomy 12:17.

[7] Deuteronomy 31:11ff.

provision would be taken literally Jerusalem would not even be a possibility for being the chosen sanctuary, for it did not belong to the territory of any tribe, but was a political entity related to and owned by the Davidic dynasty. Even at the time of Deuteronomy this fact could not have been forgotten. In the deuteronomistic work of history we hear about Judah and Jerusalem being mentioned separately, thus indicating the awareness of this distinction.[1]

The character of Deuteronomy as being a speech of Moses, which would prohibit the mention of Jerusalem as an anachronism, could speak for the chosen sanctuary as meaning Jerusalem.[2] The fact that Josiah, acting on the basis of the regulations and demands of Deuteronomy, established Jerusalem as the central cult place, does not offer any proof, however; Deuteronomy originally was not intended to fit the purposes of Josiah. The king arbitrarily interpreted Deuteronomy as sanctioning his making the capital the central sanctuary. One could say that Josiah did not wait until Yahwe chose but helped Yahwe's decision through his own actions.

A central sanctuary was nothing new to Israel. During the time of the judges Israel had a central sanctuary. One of the cult places hosted the ark and this place,

---

[1] 2 Kings 23:2. Cf. also the role of Jerusalem in the revolt of Absalom in 1 Kings 13.

[2] Dumermuth, ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 63.

through the presence of the ark which symbolized the presence of Yahwe, was elevated temporarily as the central shrine.[1] Another factor which possibly speaks for Jerusalem's being the chosen seat of Yahwe is the theologoumenon of Yahwe's שכן.[2] The idea of Yahwe's dwelling seems to be connected intimately with Zion/Jerusalem. However, a closer look at the שכן theology shows that it probably is not original to Jerusalem. The noun משכן usually is connected with the "tent of meeting".[3]

What Deuteronomy apparently tried to achieve with the שכן theology was twofold: 1) the שכן theology refers back to the time when the ark (tent of meeting) was the mobile sanctuary of the tribes. Yahwe had no definite place where he dwelt. He chose a place and it changed according to wherever Yahwe chose to reveal himself; 2) combined with the idea that Yahwe dwells in heaven,[4] the שכן theology emphasizes the uncultic character of Yahwe. This should not be called transcendentalization, because this word has connotations which

---

[1] Joshua 9:23,27; Jeremiah 7:12 (Gilgal, Shiloh).

[2] 1 Kings 8:12f.; Isaiah 8:18; 1 Kings 6:13. Dumermuth, ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 64.

[3] Numbers 1:50ff.; Exodus 25ff.; Numbers 3:3-10; 19:13; 31:30,47; Leviticus 15:31; 26:11; Joshua 22:19; most of these texts commonly are said to belong to P. We have to reckon, however, with the fact that P evaluated older traditions. Cf. Dumermuth, ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 65 and von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, pp. 38-39.

[4] Deuteronomy 4:36.

do not correspond to the reality which Deuteronomy proclaims. What Deuteronomy says is that Yahwe is lifted out of the sphere of other gods living on high mountains which are limited to the cult, in other words to the faith of their believers.[1]

Immediately after the rise of Deuteronomy, however, Josiah changed Deuteronomy's theology and made it state law by using its demands for his political ambitions. The only possible place for worship in Josiah's mind was Jerusalem. Josiah was not a man to be content with the shadowy existence which Deuteronomy prescribed for him. Yahwe exclusively worshipped in the temple in Jerusalem stood in contrast to Deuteronomy, which does not hold Yahwe to any cult place.[2] The weighty traditions of Jerusalem again got hold of the faith of Yahwe. The destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 587 served the Yahwistic purpose. After the exile Jerusalem with its holy mount was what Josiah had made it; however, the cult had been removed and the deuteronomic שכן theology now was *the* possibility of

---

[1] This also solves the problem which von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg*, p. 70, feels is posed by the discrepancy between Yahwe's dwelling in heaven and his personal presence at the same time in the camp during the holy war. The old idea does not break through here, but the camp is just one of the places in which Yahwe chooses to dwell. It is a most uncultic God who is proclaimed here, a God who is present wherever he chooses to be present. He does not come from any pre-inhabited place like Zaphon or Zion but from heaven, which means from "nowhere". The total otherness and sovereignty of Yahwe is emphasized in Deuteronomy.

[2] Hempel, *Das Ethos...*, p. 85.

understanding the presence of Yahwe as present at the sanctuary then. But even then the opposition was not removed. The Samaritan schism and its prologue in the struggles during the rebuilding of the temple under Persian sovereignty indicate this. The north never did accept the supremacy of the temple in Jerusalem.

The Deuteronomic Condemnation of All Syncretism

Again and again in Deuteronomy we meet the militant spirit of its writers, who try to cancel out six centuries wasted in sin and apostasy. Deuteronomy, so to speak, takes Israel back to Mount Horeb and the people are confronted with Yahwe again. Out of this confrontation results a new possibility. It is remarkable that Deuteronomy completely neglects the popular and prophetic eschatological concepts. Deuteronomy's proclamation of salvation is based on new obedience and this means it is based on torah.

Thatthis new possibility of salvation is not again preverted in the way the old possibility of salvation had been is the utmost concern of the writers of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy propagates a pure Yahwe cult. The deuteronomistic work of history judges every king on the basis of his idolatry. The political and military achievements do not have any weight in Deuteronomy's "yes" or "no" to a king. All the kings of Israel walked in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat. The Davidic dynasty at least has five members who receive some approval; Hezekiah and Josiah even have unlimited approval.

The writers of Deuteronomy are the first existentialists. The "here and now" of the divine election and

thus of the confrontation with the will of Yahwe, runs like a red thread through the whole book. For Deuteronomy this election meant election out of the nations. Israel is not elected because it is one of the greater nations on the face of the earth, but because Yahwe loves it.[1] Closely connected with the election is the obligation of Israel resulting from this election. First is the internal obligation: to keep the ordinances and statutes of Yahwe; second is the external obligation: to annihilate the peoples whom Yahwe will surrender to Israel. The reason for this annihilation is that other peoples exhibit the danger of converting Israelites to serve their gods.[2]

We have to emphasize that the fulfillment of the commandments and statutes is not a presupposition for salvation. Yahwe has chosen this people out of all the peoples, therefore... Yahwe's salvatory action clearly comes first, and because of the love of Yahwe the people shall keep the ordinances and statutes. The exclusiveness of the election demands an exclusiveness in Israel's relationship with the one who elected her. Israel is not even allowed to make a covenant with the peoples which she will meet.[3] "Be not beguiled", "do not copy them", and do not say "how did these nations worship their

---

[1] Deuteronomy 7:6ff.

[2] Deuteronomy 7:11,16; cf. also 4:37; 10:15.

[3] Deuteronomy 7:2.

gods?"[1] If Israel serves other and alien gods, forgetting Yahwe, the same thing which happened to other nations will happen to Israel: she will perish.[2] Yahwe is a jealous God and he will not endure Israel's service of alien gods.[3]

Deuteronomy shows a very realistic attitude toward its own people. They are stiff-necked. It is not their goodness which induced Yahwe to give them this land which he promised to their fathers.[4] It is the task of the people to destroy all altars, pillars, sacred poles, and the carved images of the nations.[5] The whole realm of the cult falls under heavy condemnation in Deuteronomy. No Israelite woman shall ever be a temple prostitute, nor shall any of the Israelite men. Earnings of any kind of prostitute shall not be brought to the temple of Yahwe.[6]

All events of the daily life of the whole nations are subjected to the will of Yahwe. Everything which could disturb or break the relationship between Yahwe and Israel is to be removed out of the midst of Israel. Deuteronomy

---

[1] Deuteronomy 12:30.

[2] Deuteronomy 8:19; 32:18.

[3] Deuteronomy 5:9; 7:4.

[4] Deuteronomy 9:6,13.

[5] Deuteronomy 12:3; 14:1.

[6] Deuteronomy 23:18.

basically is an uncultic book. There is no vacuum left which is not penetrated by the will of Yahwe. Therefore we may say that all Israel and the land which it inhabits is a cult place of Yahwe, a place where Yahwe is served.

> "When the Lord your God brings you into the land which you are entering to take possession of it, and clears away many nations before you, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than yourselves, and when the Lord your God gives them over to you, and you defeat them; then you must utterly destroy them; you shall make no covenant with them, and show no mercy to them. You shall not make marriages with them, giving your daughters to their sons or taking their daughters for your sons. For they would turn away your sons from following me, to serve other gods; then the anger of the Lord would be kindled against you, and he would destroy you quickly".[1]

---

[1] Deuteronomy 7:1-4 (Revised Standard Version).

[illegible]

> [illegible]

PART FIVE

THE NEW HOPE: DEUTERO-ISAIAH

PART FIVE

THE NEW HOPE: DEUTERO-ISAIAH

In chapters 40-55 of Isaiah we hear the last prophetic voice in Israel. It is our purpose to explain Deutero-Isaiah as a synthesis of Levitical, prophetic, and royal Jerusalemite traditions. It is quite different from the synthesis of Deuteronomy. The law does not play any role, and there does not seem to be a need to regulate the positions of prophets and kings. The kingship is gone.

Deutero-Isaiah writes after the downfall of the southern monarchy. The book mentions Cyrus of Persia,[1] which makes a date for the authorship from 558 on possible.[2] The place where it originated is not certain. Many places have been argued, such as Jerusalem, Judea, Egypt, Phoenicia, Lebanon, and Babylonia.[3] The text itself does not give any certain clue to the place of authorship. Volz decides it was Babylon and assumes that Deutero-Isaiah

---

[1] Isaiah 41:2f.,25; 46:11.

[2] Cyrus reigned from 558-529; cf. Paul Volz, Jesaja II, (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1932), p. xv.

[3] Ibid.

was the spiritual leader of the exiles.[1] This seems to be supported by Chapters 46 and 47, as they speak of the powerlessness of the gods of Babylon and the downfall of the city. Babylon's gods are not able to protect her.

In Deutero-Isaiah we find that the extreme positions of cult and prophets are surrendered. The prophets proclaimed the annihilation of Israel and some of them even prophesied the destruction of Zion. The cult had opposed the prophetic revelation and assured salvation. Now history had proven the prophets right. However, a remnant was left. History also had proven the cult wrong. Its assurances were unrealistic and it did not help Israel to survive the purge of Assyria and Neo-Babylonia. The question was, what was left? Was there any possibility of salvation even though Yahwe had apparently forsaken Israel? Then too, where was the point which would offer hope in spite of the hopeless situation?

Deutero-Isaiah tried to bring a positive message and at the same time a glorious message. The prophetic claim that Yahwe was the king of Israel was one element of hope for Deutero-Isaiah. That Yahwe was not restricted to the temple but had chosen Zion as his dwelling place was another. A new exodus meant a new creation. This is no event in mythological terms but an event in history, as when Yahwe led Israel for the first time through the desert into the promised land.

---

[1] Volz, Jesaja II, p. xvi.

was the [illegible] of the [illegible].[1] This seems to be understood by [illegible], as [illegible] of the [illegible] of the [illegible] one of [illegible] not be able to protect him.

[illegible]

---

[1] [illegible]

Chapter 40

Verses 1-11. Deutero-Isaiah begins with a word which will run like a red thread through the whole book. Deutero-Isaiah's message is a message of comfort (v.1). Jerusalem has experienced enough punishment. Her time of service has ended. The word for service is צבא. Ludwig Köhler translates צבא as "forced labor".[1] Yahwe inflicted "forced labor", which means unfree existence under the sovereignty of a foreign nation, upon Jerusalem. Jerusalem certainly does not denote here a location, but an idea. Jerusalem stands for Israel.[2]

Verse 2 recalls the passage in Isaiah 4:2-4 which regards the destruction of Jerusalem as a cleansing and purifying action of Yahwe: Yahwe has washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and the bloodstain of Jerusalem. The same passage leads over to the theme of the exodus,

---

[1] Ludwig Köhler, Deuterojesaja (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1923), p. 5. Cf. also Lindhagen, op. cit., who on p. 203 translates צבא with "conscript service".

[2] The reason that Jerusalem stands for Israel may be found in the fact that the kingdom under Zedekiah hardly included more than the territory of the former city state Jerusalem. "The cities of the south are closed up, with none to open them..." (Jeremiah 13:19; cf. Noth, Geschichte Israels, p. 256.) Thus the name Jerusalem included everything which was the southern kingdom under Zedekiah. We have to add that the Zion theology (ideology) also is responsible for the emphasis on Jerusalem. The city was the dwelling place of Yahwe. The hope of the people rested on it. The Zion theology becomes important in vv. 9ff.: from here Yahwe shall come to show his might.

which also follows in vv. 3-5. The beginning of the messianic time is announced by a new exodus.[1] Deutero-Isaiah speaks of the king's highway which shall lead through the desert. This highway shall be a smooth and even way, comfortable for the people of Yahwe to walk upon. The return from exile is a new exodus although far more glorious than the first one. As Yahwe led the people by his kabod (קבוד) which is resting over Zion (Isaiah 4:5), thus verse 5 speaks of the kabod of Yahwe which shall be revealed in a glorious theophany and all people (קל-הבשר) shall see it.

It is the purpose of Deutero-Isaiah to show the universal kingship of Yahwe, who is Lord although his people were broken and destroyed. For Deutero-Isaiah this does not prove the weakness of Yahwe, but just the opposite.[2] A voice is calling (v.6). It seems that this voice is as much a hypostasis of Yahwe as the dabar in v.8. The dabar is the same as Yahwe but still is distinguished from him.[3] As it is Yahwe's speaking in v. 5 which gives authority to his kabod in the eyes of the nations (קל-הבשר), thus the dabar of Yahwe stands over the events of history

---

[1] The early prophets already refer to the Mosaic time as the ideal (Hosea 2:16-19; 12:10; Amos 5:21-25). The depiction of the eschatological time reckons with a new march through the sea of reeds (cf. Isaiah 10:24f.; 11:15f.).

[2] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 4.

[3] Grether, op. cit., p. 134.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

and guarantees that nothing happens without plan (v.8). The *dabar 'olam* stands beyond the changing situations of history. The picture of the Sirocco (vv. 6-7) is used to proclaim the finiteness of all people as against the *dabar 'olam*. These verses should be seen in connection with vv. 3-5. The nations which try to oppose the *dabar* will experience the same fate which the flowers of the field experience when the Sirocco blows over them. Certainly Deutero-Isaiah is thinking of nations which could possibly hinder the new exodus and the restoration of Jerusalem,[1] or the sense of hopelessness and defeatism of many Israelites.

Deutero-Isaiah uses the scheme of a cult liturgy[2] with its liturgic voices and glad tidings to illustrate the procession of the king, Yahwe, up to Jerusalem, his mountain.[3] This scheme began with v.3 in referring to the marvelous highway which Yahwe is building. Here we have a change from the original scheme of the royal procession up to Jerusalem. The highway here is not for Yahwe the king, it is for the returning exiles. Jerusalem and the returning people fulfill "merely" a servant position. It is not the entrance and procession of the exiles which is

---

[1] Mowinckel, *Psalmen studien II*, p. 257.

[2] Ivan Engnell, "The Ebed Jahwe Songs and the Suffering Messiah in "Deutero-Isaiah", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1948), XXXI (1948), p. 64.

[3] Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II*, p. 241.

proclaimed as "gospel", but the entrance of Yahwe, coming to his kingship, to his throne on Zion. As in the first exodus, when Yahwe's outstretched arm and his mighty hand brought Israel out of Egypt,[1] now it is Yahwe's arm which is the symbol of his might;(v.10) Yahwe establishes his kingdom through his own power; the messianic metaphor of the shepherd and the lamb[2] illustrates the security and shelter in which Israel/Jerusalem is living.[3]

Deutero-Isaiah used a liturgical scheme of a royal procession to proclaim the entry of the true king of Israel into his city. The subject is not, however, a cultic event as it had been in the royal liturgy; instead it is Yahwe active in history, leading his people like a shepherd, bringing his flock through the desert. A cultic frame with a content derived from prophetic proclamations mixed with Zion theology makes up the first section of Chapter 40 (vv. 1-11). Deutero-Isaiah does not belittle the judgment of Yahwe, but he sees salvation rising out of it. In and through the judgment Yahwe established his kingship which, visible to all nations, he shall maintain on Zion.

---

[1] Exodus 6:6; 15:6.

[2] Engnell, Bulletin..., XXXI (1948), p. 65.

[3] Possibly Deutero-Isaiah refers with his shepherd symbol to the ancient title of the Babylonian kings. (Cf. Jirku, op. cit., p. 202.) The so-called Merodach-Baladan stone has a reference to Marduk directing the following words to the king of Babylon: "This be the shepherd gathering the dispersed". Deutero-Isaiah may have used the shepherd symbol to point to the true shepherd as against those who have not the power to be shepherds.

Chapter 40, Verses 12-31. The incomparability of Yahwe is proclaimed not only to Israel but to all nations. This great hymn very probably is triggered by the desperation and disillusionment of Israel.[1] The people feel forsaken by Yahwe. They seem to have submitted to the inevitable. They no longer believe in any saving action. The ancient people believed that the powerlessness of a nation demonstrated the weakness of its god. Was it not obvious that Yahwe had been defeated by Marduk? But Yahwe was not dead. He was a אל עולם. '*Olam* hardly denotes here a metaphysical characteristic of Yahwe,[2] but points toward the history of Israel among the nations. This proves that Yahwe is '*olam* and not an idol because he called Israel out of Egypt; this was the beginning, and he has never left her since, which meant doom and judgment once, but now means salvation. '*Olam* is the guarantee of continuity of Yahwe's love. Whatever happens to Israel, it is Yahwe who does it; it is Yahwe whom Israel meets wherever she turns.

'*Olam* does not mean timelessness. It rather characterizes the hiddenness and unknownness of time and thus of Yahwe.[3] Yahwe's '*olam* stands against the wooden

---

[1] Or Jacob. As always in Deutero-Isaiah names such as Jerusalem, Zion and Jacob denote the totality of Israel.

[2] Jenni, *ZAW*, LXV (1953), p. 16.

[3] Gesenius, *op. cit.*, p. 571: עולם means the unknown, the hidden time.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

idols (v.20). What are they compared to Yahwe? There is no likeness to him (v.18). Yahwe cannot be conceived as an idol, even if overlaid with gold (v.19). He is beyond all images. The only way to recognize him is to see his numerous works in nature and history. The nations are nothing before him. This means those who oppress Israel and cause its desperation have no power (v.17). Yahwe is the creator of heaven and earth. He stretches the heaven like a tent.[1] We find here a complete demythologization of nature. The stars which for ancient people were great gods and were worshipped as such are creations of Yahwe.[2]

Like the prophets before him, Deutero-Isaiah preaches faith and trust in Yahwe. The prophet's hope is not a holy war. Yahwe has outgrown this sphere. His lordship is undisputed because he is creator (v.28). The abundance of Yahwe's strength is contrasted with the faintness and weariness of the people (vv. 28-31).[3] Verse 31 also recalls Exodus 19:4, where Yahwe earned the trust of Israel when he brought her on eagle's wings out of Egypt to her destination.[4] Here in v. 31 Yahwe shows the same care for his people. The strength of Yahwe will be in those who set their hope on him.

---

[1] Psalm 104:2 also.

[2] The term צבא reminds us of the title Yahwe Sabaoth. Yahwe commands the stars as his army. The militia of Israel no longer is necessary to represent the force of Yahwe. He is the ruler of his creation; the stars even serve him. Cf. also Psalm 147:4.

[3] Volz, Jesaja II, pp. 13-14; Psalm 103:5; 84:8.

[4] Cf. also Deuteronomy 32:11.

Chapter 41

Verses 1-5. Deutero-Isaiah continues to proclaim the lordship of Yahwe over all nations. The nations have been the executors of Yahwe's punishment of Israel. But they believed themselves to be acting on their own behalf, for their own purposes. They did not understand that they were servants of Yahwe. They did not recognize that Yahwe was the true cause of the punishment inflicted upon Israel. Because they have exhibited their pride, Yahwe will bring another servant up from the east to punish the punishers. Who is the one that is roused from the east? Who is called in righteousness to Yahwe's service? Here for the first time Cyrus appears in Deutero-Isaiah. The one from the east is the Persian king. It is Yahwe's righteousness that made Cyrus rise and act as a servant of Yahwe.[1]

It is typical for Deutero-Isaiah that he does not hail Cyrus as saviour of Israel but that he praises Yahwe for what he does through his servant Cyrus. Cyrus is nothing but the human means through which Yahwe pursues

---

[1] Note the different use of צדק in Deutero-Isaiah as compared to its use in the pre-exilic prophets. There צדק denotes social justice and mainly covenantal righteousness as demanded by Yahwe (cf. Amos 5:7; Hosea 10:12; Isaiah 5:7; Jeremiah 22:3; Zephaniah 2:3). In Deutero-Isaiah צדק usually is a gift of Yahwe. The bachar relationship between Yahwe and Israel which we know from Deuteronomy bears theological fruit in Deutero-Isaiah. Yahwe has chosen his people. He will remain true to his choice and act righteously with Israel (cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 16).

[illegible]

[illegible] of Wynn [illegible]

[illegible] for their own purposes. [illegible] that the [illegible] of Wynn. [illegible] cause of [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] p. 10.

his will with his people. Yahwe the creator and Yahwe the God of history again are one. Referring to the messenger Cyrus, Deutero-Isaiah speaks of Yahwe the creator "who called the generations in the beginning" (v.4); he is responsible for what his servant Cyrus does.[1]

Chapter 41, Verses 6-20.[2] In verses 8-16 we have the first "servant song". Israel, Jacob, and the descendants of Abraham are used parallel as names for the whole of Israel. Israel is called עבד. The community is addressed as an individual. The servant here is addressed as "thou", and has a right hand (v.13).[3] Closely connected with the title servant for Israel is the bachar idea. The

---

[1] The pre-exilic prophets do not know Yahwe as creator. The realm of nature was tabu to them because it was the realm of the Canaanite gods which they battled. Deutero-Isaiah proclaims Yahwe as universal Lord, that means as Lord over history and nature. The early prophetic message proclaiming Yahwe Sabaoth, the leader of Israel's militia, and the cultic message proclaiming the orders of nature are governed by Baal and Ashtart, or in popular Yahwism by Yahwe-Baal, are assimilated in Deutero-Isaiah. For him there is no conflict between history and nature. Both are under the lordship of one God, Yahwe.

[2] We agree with Volz that vv. 6-7 which usually are located behind 40:19 (see the translators of the American Translation and Köhler, op. cit., p. 8) do not supplement 40:19 but rather are a parallel. The idols are treated ironically (cf. Isaiah 40:20; 41:6-7; 46:7; Jeremiah 10:4); they have to be tied so that they do not move. The verses probably are a non-Isianic fragment. The reason for its insertion in its present place between 41:5 and 41:8 cannot be discerned (cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 14, Anm. 1).

[3] Cf. Isaiah 42:19: he has eyes but does not hear; also 44:1-2: he was created in his mother's womb. Cf. Otto Eissfeldt, "The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah 40-55 in the Light of the Israelite conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real", Expository Times, XLIV (1932-33), p. 264.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Jerusalemite royal ideology had combined the titles "servant" (ebed) and chosen (bachar).[1] Yahwe chose Israel and thus created it his servant.[2] This becomes apparent when we notice that Deutero-Isaiah never speaks of the election by Yahwe as a promise but as of something which has already happened. The bachar ideology seems to be used as proof for Deutero-Isaiah's proclamations of salvation.

Deutero-Isaiah clearly adopted here the form of the priestly-prophetical oracle of salvation.[3] The Gattung of the priestly oracle of salvation - declares Begrich - is noticeable because the individual units of the oracle are determined by their original situation in the royal rituals of the temple: prayers of an individual, his mourning, then the appearance of a priest with a comforting oracle from Yahwe for the praying person. Verses 10, 13, and 14 form such a comforting oracle introduced by "fear not".[4]

---

[1] Cf. the above, pages 182f. for ebed, and 186f. for bachar. Deutero-Isaiah uses the terminology of royal ideology to describe the servant. We will see later what significance this usage of royal terminology has for the character of the servant in Deutero-Isaiah when we try to identify the servant of Deutero-Isaiah. The servant, which is the remnant or the true Israel, will occupy the same position as the Jerusalem king did. However, the servant stands in a universal frame while the king stands in a national frame only.

[2] Koch, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 220.

[3] Ibid., p. 221; cf. also Joachim Begrich, "Das Priesterliche Heilsorakel," ZAW, LII (1934), p. 82.

[4] Begrich, ZAW, LII (1934), p. 82.

[illegible]

[illegible]

of the greatly [illegible] of [illegible]

philosophic [illegible] the individual [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Before Deutero-Isaiah, the king in Jerusalem was the chosen one of Yahwe and his servant.[1] The Jerusalem tradition had never become an all-Israelite tradition, however. Never do we hear about a northern king as being chosen and a servant of Yahwe. Deuteronomy with its northern emphasis was the first to change the bachar theology as found in Jerusalem. Deuteronomy derives the fact that Israel has been chosen from the exodus out of Egypt. Deutero-Isaiah goes along with Deuteronomy in adopting the royal bachar assurance as assurance for the help of Yahwe for the whole people. Therefore it is not astonishing that the election of David, of Zion, and of the priests is missing in Deutero-Isaiah. Deutero-Isaiah more radically than anyone before him assures the election of the whole people. It is also new that the election of Israel now becomes effective in history, while before in the royal bachar theology the election had been a cultic event.

Deutero-Isaiah does not know anything about a king. This statement will become important in determining the nature of the suffering servant. All titles of the king are used to designate Israel. The pre-exilic prophets had connected the election of Israel with the exodus from Egypt. The second exodus from Babylon is the more a symbol for the election of Israel. Here Yahwe proved himself to be Lord over all nations and creator. The emphasis on Yahwe

---

[1] 1 Samuel 10:24; 16:8-10; 2 Samuel 6:21.

in vv. 8ff. is remarkable. The person of Yahwe stands in the center of the saving actions: I am, I have chosen, my servant, etc. No matter that Israel is weak and may easily be overcome by other nations. Yahwe has chosen Israel and that means life because it means help from Yahwe (vv. 10-13).

In verse 14 for the first time the term גאל appears; Deutero-Isaiah uses it frequently to designate Yahwe.[1] The term גאל has its origin in the family and clan law.[2] The go'el is the one who has the legal duty to redeem someone who is in jail because he did not fulfill his financial liability. As with the redemption from Egypt,[3] Yahwe now redeems his enslaved chosen ones from Babylon. Yahwe redeems Israel into his service (vv. 15-16). The purpose of the redemption from Babylon is to exalt the Holy One of Israel.

Procksch has pointed out the paradox which the term קדוש ישראל contains.[4] As קדוש Yahwe is separated from creation - one may almost say stands in opposition to it because creation is not kadosh - and from history. Yahwe as the kadosh has as his goal the עם קדוש,

---

[1] Isaiah 43:14; 44:6,24; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7; 54:8.

[2] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 21.

[3] Exodus 6:6.

[4] In Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch..., I, p. 93. The paradox means the simultaneous separatedness and involvedness of Yahwe kadosh, or in other words "in but not of the world".

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

which appears in the remnant of Israel.[1] In Isaiah the title kadosh therefore was mainly connected with judgment. Deutero-Isaiah transforms the significance. Here the kadosh of Israel is just the guarantee for salvation. The most amazing fact which Deutero-Isaiah proclaims is that Yahwe, the kadosh, who is beyond creation and history and cannot be conceived of by man, is the saviour of Israel and is close to his chosen one (vv. 17-20). In his holiness lies Yahwe's power and strength to call a small and weak, meek nation his servant and to use as his servant great and powerful nations like Persia, and to make Assyria the rod of his anger.

Chapter 41, Verses 21-29.[2] The king Yahwe is compared with gods who are to prove their strength. Are they able to prophesy? Yahwe will wait and see whether their prophecies come true or not (vv. 21-23). The gods are nothing, and their word is worth nothing (v.24). Israel is the witness of Yahwe that the dabar of Yahwe is, in contrast to the words of the gods, a powerful word and that his prophecy is right. It is interesting that Deutero-Isaiah considers Cyrus to be a worshipper of Yahwe. This may be nothing but a peculiar expression of the fact mentioned above, that Cyrus is a servant of Yahwe.

---

[1] Isaiah 10:21; 4:5; 5:16.

[2] We follow Volz, Jesaja II, p. 24, in his judgment on v.27; the verse is completely garbled. The original text cannot be reconstructed. Vv. 27-8 really are one verse. The mention of Zion and Jerusalem is strange. The Septuagint has a completely different text. We delete v. 27 and thus v. 28 follows v. 26; both have the same theme.

[illegible] persons in the [illegible] against the [illegible] [illegible] accordance with [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Chapter 42

Verses 10-22.[1] Deutero-Isaiah imitates a throne ascension psalm in verses 10-17.[2] The powers of chaos, the enemies of Yahwe in the cult, here join the chorus of praise for Yahwe. The whole creation sings to Yahwe a new song. The punishment of Israel will not last forever. Only with great restraint has Yahwe kept silence.[3] The famous old picture of Yahwe as a warrior is followed by the even more human one of Yahwe as the woman who gives birth. Probably Deutero-Isaiah has the new birth of Israel in

---

[1] Verses 1-9 form the first ebed song. We will treat the ebed songs together after the rest of the texts of Chapters 40-55 have been discussed. Sometimes the ebed songs are considered to be a different work, distinct from the remaining portions of Chapters 40-55. This removes the influence of the major portion of Chapters 40-55 on the question of the identity of the servant.

It is felt that the identity of the servant is more easily established when the servant songs are considered independently. We will consider them independently. One reason for our procedure is convenience; the evidence of the servant songs is discussed together. The second reason is to show that the songs and their context should not be assigned to different authors. Chapters 40-55 without the ebed songs establish the same identity of the servant as the ebed songs proper.

[2] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 195, and Lindhagen, op. cit., p. 202.

[3] One wonders about the meaning of this silence. Does Deutero-Isaiah deny that Yahwe had spoken to the prophets? Does the silence include only the time from the beginning of the exile until now? Is the silence a descriptive term saying that what happened until now in history cannot be compared with what will happen? Yahwe will show only now his true intentions with his people; everything preceding the new situation was like silence compared to the roar of joy and victory about Yahwe, the strong warrior (vv. 10-13).

mind. The following verses refer to the new exodus. The first exodus was understood by the pre-exilic prophets as the birth of Israel. Deutero-Isaiah joins his predecessors in interpreting the new exodus as the new birth of Israel.[1]

On a marvelous way through the deserts and the waters will Yahwe lead his people (vv. 14-15). Israel is blind and therefore needs the leading arm of Yahwe to guide it home. That Israel is called blind (vv. 18-19,7) is an accusation by Yahwe. They have not observed what Yahwe did in history with Israel. They have trusted molten images (v.17). This word surely is directed against Israel and not the enemies of Israel are meant.[2] Possibly there are still some who do not recognize that Yahwe is the Lord. They shall not partake in the new exodus and in the new birth.[3]

Verses 18ff. clearly state that it is Yahwe's righteousness which will save Israel and not some quality which Israel would have to make herself attractive. She did not recognize that it was Yahwe who punished her ment. The [illegible] The [illegible] of [illegible] of Lorenz,

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 49 and Gressmann, op. cit., p. 185, but against Volz, Jesaja II, p. 31.

[2] Contrary to Volz, Jesaja II, p. 31.

[3] This accusation may very well have a historical background. Not all Israelites returned from Babylon to rebuild Jerusalem. Possibly Deutero-Isaiah is accusing them because they do not have any national hope. They have adjusted to the Babylonian way of life, have found a new home and have joined the Babylonians in their worship of molten images; cf. 44:9ff.; 48:5-7; 49:14.

[illegible] The [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

because she sinned against him (v.24). Israel does not know how to interpret the signs of the times; she is deaf and blind toward the events which she experiences. Yahwe is not only a God of salvation, he is also the cause of all the trouble of Israel.

Deutero-Isaiah picks up the theme of the pre-exilic prophets who proclaimed the punishment of Yahwe against the people who were so sure of Yahwe's being a God of salvation. "Peace, peace" was what the cult proclaimed as a message of Yahwe, although there was no peace, because Israel had sinned against Yahwe. Deutero-Isaiah continues on the same line, interpreting the destructive events as the punishment of Yahwe. The people, however, did not return or repent. They were blind and deaf. If Yahwe would not have committed himself to saving his people, a remnant of it, there would be no chance. The comfort of Deutero-Isaiah is not unconditional comfort. He does not belittle the sin of his people and his creed is not the quality of Israel. She remains deaf and blind. Therefore she needs a leader. To prove his holiness and lordship over all nations and creation, Yahwe does what he does. There is no other reason.

Chapter 43

Verses 1-7. If Begrich is right that the "fear not" (v.1)[1] is a formula adopted from the priestly oracle of salvation, we must note that this oracle of salvation here in Deutero-Isaiah is introduced by a formula which we know as introduction of a prophetic oracle: כה־אמר יהוה. Deutero-Isaiah uses hymnic tradition when he speaks of Yahwe the creator.[2] This tradition is transformed, however; Deutero-Isaiah does not just use examples of cultic hymnology, he actualizes the message which these hymns bear for his present situation. The hymns of creation become a decisive part of Deutero-Isaiah's proclamation that salvation is happening here and now.[3]

The fact that Yahwe is the creator of the world constitutes his strength and might to do with his creation

---

[1] Begrich, ZAW, LII (1934), pp. 81-82.

[2] Rolf Rendtorff, "Die theologische Stellung des Schöpfungsglaubens bei Deuterojesaja", ZTK, LXIII (1954), p.7.

[3] This is not the first time that we find Deutero-Isaiah adopting forms of cultic origin or from Jerusalemite royal ideology. Deutero-Isaiah had used the titles of the Jerusalem king to describe the servant Israel (cf. pp. 405f.). Those titles of course bear all cultic significance of the king, the status of the king and his functions (for example as representative of the national corporate whole). Here we find that Deutero-Isaiah adopts hymnic formulations. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, emphasizes Deutero-Isaiah's affinity to the psalms, especially to the throne ascension psalms. Yahwe the creator had been a cultic reality for prophetism until now. Deutero-Isaiah combines creation and history as he combines prophetical and cultic traditions. This is the reason why Deutero-Isaiah marks the end of the discussion on prophetism and cult.

whatever he pleases to do. Yahwe is the creator of Israel in a very special sense. Yahwe's creation of Israel established a close relationship.[1] This means that Israel is not just a part of creation but a very special part.

Yahwe has chosen Israel from among all nations of the world.[2] Here the old prophetic particularism is preserved in Deutero-Isaiah. The prophets had proclaimed the particular relationship between Yahwe and Israel. They had not legitimated this relationship with the fact that Yahwe created all nations but with the fact that Yahwe had delivered Israel from Egypt. At the same time Deutero-Isaiah shows a universalistic attitude.[3] Yahwe has rights over all nations. He can use them for whatever purposes he wants to use them. He can call Cyrus from his homeland and use him to deliver Israel from Babylon. Deutero-Isaiah denies the existence of other gods. They are not gods because they cannot prove their god-ness.[4]

---

[1] For this close relationship Hosea uses the picture of marriage (1:ff.), or sometimes the picture of father and son is used (Exodus 4:22; Jeremiah 2:3; Deuteronomy 32:6; Isaiah 1:2; 43:6; Hosea 11:1-4, etc.). In the same sense the term creator is to be understood in Deutero-Isaiah. Cf. Galling, op. cit., p. 4.

[2] Isaiah 41:9;42:6.

[3] Clearly in 43:10 which denies that any god was before Yahwe. Deutero-Isaiah's polemic probably turns here against the gods of Babylon, for example, where always new gods were born through the old ones (cf. Enuma Elish). The younger gods usurp the position of the older ones: Amon displaces Re, Marduk displaces Bel, etc. (cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 41) while Yahwe is the first and last. Cf. 41:4: I am now, as I have been and ever will be.

[4] Isaiah 41:21ff.; 43:9ff.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

For Deutero-Isaiah Yahwe's acting in history and acting as creator is the same. This is clearly shown by his using terminology of creation for Yahwe's actions in history. Yahwe created Jacob and punished him. Now Yahwe's message is: "fear not, I have redeemed you" (v.1). Yahwe shall protect Israel throughout all danger. Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sheba are given as ransom for Israel.[1]

Yahwe has called Israel by name (v.1). This term occurs again in 41:26 and 45:3. The first time Yahwe called the stars by their names; the second time it is Cyrus who is called into the service of Yahwe to liberate Israel. It seems that the term denotes at first creation, as in the case of Israel and the stars. A name denotes character for the Hebrews. The one who gives a name shows through the name-giving his superiority and lordship. When Jacob had the encounter with Yahwe his name was changed. Slaves frequently

---

[1] It is doubtful who is meant to be the receiver of this ransom. According to Volz, Jesaja II, p. 37, Cyrus, the vicegerent of Yahwe is the receiver of the ransom. Deutero-Isaiah does not speak about Israel's rulership of the world. Looking at a parallel to 43:1-6 in Psalm 2:7-8 it is clear that the psalmist conceives Israel as inheriting the nations, thus proposing the world rulership of Israel. To be sure, Deutero-Isaiah does not indicate anything like Psalm 2. One other possibility would be that Yahwe is the receiver of the ransom. Deutero-Isaiah does not overlook the sin of Israel (42:5f.; 43:8f.). The new creation is not a right of Israel. It is a merciful deed of Yahwe and his initiative alone. The word for ransom, כפר, is in its verbal form a technical term of priestly sacrificial language (cf. Genseius, op. cit., p. 359), with the meaning of offering sacrifices of atonement. This may help us further. Possibly Yahwe is accepting other nations such as Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sheba as atonement for Israel. This may be supported by verse 4b although again no receiver is mentioned.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] called into the service of [illegible]

[illegible] the term [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

were given new names by their master. With a new name a new life began. At the same time calling one's name means a call to service. When Cyrus is called this is very clear. That this is also true for Israel is clear. Israel is the servant of Yahwe.[1]

Chapter 43, Verses 9-21. That Israel is the servant of Yahwe is the meaning of verses 9-21. You are my witness to the nations, says Yahwe (vv. 8,10). You are my servant, whom I have chosen (v.10) that they (the nations) may know and believe me. As creator of Israel Yahwe is the king of Israel[2] (v.15). The proclamation of Yahwe the creator is not at all the center of the message of Deutero-Isaiah.[3] Every time Deutero-Isaiah speaks of Yahwe the creator he turns around and applies the lordship of Yahwe, resulting from his creatorship, to the present historical situation. Creation is not something which once happened in the beginning. It is happening here and now. (v.19).

Again as in 42:19 we find that Israel is still blind and deaf (v.8). In spite of this Yahwe chose Israel as his servant with a commission to the nations (vv. 10-13). For the first time we hear a word against Babylon (v.14). Verses 16f. point back to the exodus from Egypt when Yahwe showed

---

[1] Isaiah 42:5-9.

[2] Isaiah 42:10-17. Cf. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 214.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 141.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

his saving hand when he made a path through the Sea of Reeds and destroyed the chariots of the Egyptians. Immediately comes the command not to look back. It is a new thing which Yahwe will do. The new creation stands in parallel to the old, only the new deed of salvation will be much more glorious than the old. Verses 19-21 point back to 42:14-17.

Chapter 43, Verses 22-28. This passage begins with a truly prophetic accusation against the vain service Israel is rendering Yahwe with offerings and sacrifices.[1] The sacrifices have no legitimation from Yahwe (v.23b). Deutero-Isaiah clearly refutes the cult at this place. If Israel wants to argue with Yahwe they should argue that because of her cultic righteousness she has a right to salvation. There is no chance for the people because Yahwe could not be bribed with sacrifices. Their ancestors, prophets, and princes sinned against Yahwe. Therefore Yahwe gave Jacob up to utter destruction (vv. 26-28). For his own sake Yahwe forgets the transgressions of Israel. It is Yahwe who creates Israel anew for his own mercy's sake.

Going back from this passage to the one discussed above (vv. 1-6), where we found it difficult to decide who was the receiver of the ransom, we now have the answer. Verse 25 possibly indicates that it is Yahwe's. The destruction which should have continued because the people transgressed

---

[1] Jeremiah 7:21-23; Amos 5:25.

and still are deaf and blind is removed from Israel. Yahwe himself redeemed Israel. He then is the receiver of the ransom. If Cyrus were the receiver of the ransom in vv. 1-6, it would seem that Yahwe would have to account for his actions to Cyrus. Cyrus, however, is nothing more than a servant. Between Cyrus and Yahwe there exists no problem which would have to be removed. The problem is the relationship between Yahwe and Israel. If anyone is to receive ransom for anything he lost, it is Yahwe.

Chapter 44

Verses 1-8. Israel is addressed as an individual. Besides Jacob and Israel another name appears for the chosen people: Jeshurun. The meaning of this name is not clear. It seems to stem from poetical language.[1] Yahwe is the creator, who formed Israel from the womb[2] and therefore will help Israel. Again we note the connection between bachar and ebed. The election through Yahwe is a creative work which makes Israel Yahwe's servant.[3] Creation and salvation are closely linked in v.2: "who formed you and helps you".[4]

Verse 3 should not be understood as a natural event of growth,[5] but as a metaphor describing, like verse 3b, what shall happen to Israel. Like water on the thirsty ground Yahwe will revive Israel.[6] The ruah of Yahwe is the

---

[1] Deuteronomy 32:15; 33:5,26. Cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 47.

[2] Isaiah 43:21; 42:14.

[3] Koch, ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 220.

[4] Cf. also v. 24: your redeemer, גאלך, and then your former (creator), יצרך. Creation and salvation actually are one and the same thing. Both are so merged that the two are interchangable (cf. Rendtorff, ZTK, LXIII (1954), p. 10.

[5] This is what Volz, Jesaja II, p. 47, believes.

[6] Engnell, Bulletin..., XXXI (1948), p. 67, considers the pouring of water and pouring of spirit as a feature of Tammuz ideology. The name Jeshurun also for him clearly indicates relation to Tammuz ideology. We do not have to decide the truth of his thesis here. Validity or non-validity of his thesis does not change the meaning of this passage.

true source of life.[1] Verse 4 also is such a metaphor: the people will be like growing grass in a swamp, etc. The verses 5-6 do not refer to Jews weak in faith or even to proselytes[2] but depict the ideal Israel, the new Israel, which will truly be a servant of Yahwe. These verses very much remind us of the people of the new covenant in Jeremiah.[3]

The kingship of Yahwe is proclaimed and acknowledged by his people. As in 41:21-29 and 43:9-13, Deutero-Isaiah proclaims the sole divinity of Yahwe. There is no other god.[4] The formula "I am the first and I am the last" is Yahwe's proclamation that everything has its beginning and its end in him. Apart from him there is no god. If there are any other gods they will come and prove their strength.[5] Israel is witness for the uniqueness of Yahwe. Have other gods prophesied what shall happen in the future, in other words did they keep their promises, if they indeed gave any?

Chapter 44, Verses 21-22.[6] Creation and salvation

---

[1] Ezekiel 37; Isaiah 32:15; Psalm 104:30.

[2] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 48, believes this.

[3] Jeremiah 31.

[4] cf. v. 9; Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 211.

[5] Verses 7-8 and 41:22f.

[6] Many interpreters consider the preceeding passage 44:9-20 as non-Deutero-Isainic. It shows a different style, using prose, and a remarkable use of tempora (cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 51). The passage describes in detail the making of idols, probably in order to emphasize the fact that they are human creations. We find resemblances with 40:19f.; 41:6f.; 46:5-7 in 44:9-20. On grounds of style we suggest that this passage is the work of a later apologist feeling the need to give more emphasis to the Deutero-Isianic refutation of idols. This theme certainly does not form the center of Deutero-Isaiah's message.

are linked again. Israel the servant implies that Yahwe has chosen Israel (v.21). The people sometimes may have thought that Yahwe had forgotten them. Here is the assurance that this is not so. Light and fast as a cloud or a mist is destroyed by the sun will Yahwe remove Israel's guilt.[1] It is Israel's responsibility to return to Yahwe, because Yahwe has redeemed her; one may as well say because Yahwe returned Israel.[2]

Chapter 44, Verse 23. Heaven and the depth of the earth, mountains and the whole forest join in joy over the redemption of Israel. The phraseology which we find here reminds us of the throne ascension psalms.[3]

Chapter 44, Verses 24-28. Again the passage opens with the creation-salvation combination: Yahwe is redeemer and former in the womb.[4] Yahwe is alive in the *dabar* of

---

[1] For the picture of the cloud see Hosea 6:4; 13:3.

[2] We discussed above the meaning of the Hebrew גאל: the duty of the next relative to redeem the debts (sometimes blood debts, blood vengeance) of one member of his family. Yahwe, fulfilling this function with Israel, stands in the position of the close relative redeeming one belonging to him. The situation, however, is more intricate in the case of Yahwe and Israel because Yahwe is redeeming Israel with himself. There is no third party. Yahwe is both redeemer and the one who receives the redemption because he is the "third part", or the opponent.

[3] Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II*, p. 199; for the rejoicing of nature cf. Isaiah 42:10f.; 49:13; 55:12.

[4] It is interesting to compare the phrasing of Deutero-Isaiah with that of the psalms. Compare Psalm 136:5-6 with 44:24-28. The psalm refers to the actions of Yahwe when he created the world. In vv. 10-22 the events from the exodus until the invasion in Canaan are presented. General

his servants and their predictions are Yahwe's message (v.26). Diviners and soothsayers are made fools because they do not have a dabar and thus no authority as messengers of Yahwe. We may assume here that Deutero-Isaiah is referring to the prophetical controversy, nabi as against nebiim, with their message of "peace, peace".

It is remarkable that Deutero-Isaiah now proclaims a similar message of assurance of salvation which the cult with its priests and prophets proclaimed before the exile. However, Deutero-Isaiah knows the punishment and destruction which preceeded the new possibility of salvation. The message of doom of the pre-exilic prophets was not the last word of Yahwe, although it may have looked like it. Deutero-Isaiah, however, also emphasizes that it is Yahwe's work alone which brings a new creation. No cult is now involved. It is Yahwe who spoke through the prophets, it is he who frustrated diviners and soothsayers, it is he who entrusted Cyrus with a task of deliverance, and it is he who promises a new temple (vv. 26-28). Who helped Yahwe when he made everything? No one, thus there is no other to turn to; there is no one else with strength to do all this (v.24).

---

remarks conclude the psalm (cf. Rendtorff, ZTK, LXIII (1954), p. 6). Quite different is the procedure in Deutero-Isaiah. Here we do not find an orderly succession of events. Creation and salvation are the same; they do not follow one another. The psalms certainly had Sitz im Leben in the cult. This may be indicated already by the stereotype response: "for his kindness is everlasting". But Deutero-Isaiah's Sitz im Leben is not the cult. His language is too immediate, his interest in the events too actual and his interpretation of creation too prophetical.

Chapter 45

Verses 1-7. The only time in the Old Testament that we hear about a non-Israelite being called "anointed" is here in v.1. Yahwe has grasped Cyrus' right hand, which probably means that Yahwe calls him and firmly leads him through the task which Cyrus is to do.[1] In our previous discussion about the meaning of "anointed" we said that cultic objects like the ark were anointed. Anointing means to separate something from the rest for special purpose. In the case of cult objects this purpose is clear. However, in the case of a king, for instance David as anointed by a prophet, Samuel, the purpose is a little more complicated. We also said the Messiah (anointed) is Yahwe in Israel. This suggests the first function of an anointed: he is the representative of Yahwe.

---

[1] Cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 59; also Isaiah 42:6; 41:13; 51:18. Cf. C.C. Torrey, The Second Isaiah (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. 40ff., p. 357. Torrey argues for the deletion of "to Cyrus" in Chapter 45 (also 44:28) mainly on the basis of metric complications in the text and also on grounds of logic. However, metric reasons for deletions are not convincing; logic is no argument at all because logic certainly was not supposed to be one of the virtues of Old Testament authors. We accept the mention of Cyrus because no convincing argument against it exists. Furthermore, the political situation supports the mention of Cyrus (Torrey denies the historical background of Babylon for Deutero-Isaiah). Most important, the mention of Cyrus does not provide any exegetical difficulty.

The other purpose of the anointed is to serve Yahwe. He is nothing through himself; his legitimation lies in his being anointed, that means in his designation by Yahwe. The king, for the prophets, was and had to be an official. The title anointed does not primarily contain a connection with Israel but with Yahwe.[1] This corresponds to the universal sovereignty of Yahwe. He can choose anyone he wants to, for that is his right. He is not limited to Israel. Yahwe will give the nations into Cyrus' hands. It is freely admitted that Cyrus does not know Yahwe (v.4b), but Yahwe chose to reveal his might through this servant. It is assumed that the servant will recognize the sovereignty of Yahwe (v.3), and more specifically Cyrus shall know that Yahwe, who called him, is the God of Israel (v.3b).

The purpose of Cyrus' mission is clearly stated, and thus Cyrus' mission is limited and distinguished from the mission of the other servant, which is Israel itself. Again we find that in his universalism (calling a foreigner to service) Yahwe exercises strict particularism when he makes the servant Cyrus act for the benefit of the servant Israel. Mowinckel finds it difficult to reconcile the world rule of the foreigner Cyrus with the world rule of Israel.[2] Mowinckel finds the only way out of this problem

---

[1] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 59.

[2] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 292.

to explain the world rule of Israel as an eschatological dogma originated in the throne ascension myth.[1]

If there would exist any difficulty between a world rule of Israel and a world rule of Cyrus it would mean that there is no difference between the servant Israel and the servant Cyrus. However, it is very clear that the purpose of and the function of the servant Cyrus is very limited. He never achieves the status before Yahwe which Yahwe has given to his chosen one Israel. Deutero-Isaiah also never speaks of a world rule of Israel. It is the world rule of Yahwe which is proclaimed through the servant Israel continuously, while the same is proclaimed through the servant Cyrus only temporarily and indirectly. Cyrus' service is rendered directly to Israel because of the will of Yahwe. Israel's service is much more immediate to Yahwe. Here nothing stands in between. We may say that Israel is a servant of first order, while Cyrus and other possible tools in Yahwe's hands are servants of second order.

We grant Mowinckel that Deutero-Isaiah only once speaks explicitly about the kingship of Yahwe.[2] However, practically every passage speaking about Yahwe's deeds in creation and history proclaims the sovereignty and thus the kingship of Yahwe. Through its implications Deutero-Isaiah

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 293.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 292; cf. also Isaiah 52:7.

is a book centering in the kingship of Yahwe. It is this which has to be re-established in the minds of Israel: Yahwe is king. It seemed that Yahwe had died because his strength seemed to have been destroyed with the strength of his people. Deutero-Isaiah mobilizes the traditions of his people and added the new, the universal kingship of Yahwe. This explained the defeat of Israel. The victors were tools in Yahwe's hands, punishing Israel - as the prophets had proclaimed - for her faithlessness.

Chapter 45, Verses 8-13. The creator commands his creation to bring forth salvation.[1] Yahwe does not account to anyone for the work of his hands. It would be like the pot asking the potter, "what are you making?" Yahwe stands above men and creation. He is not a part of it himself. Volz suggests that these verses (9-13) have as a historical background the rebellion of the Israelites in Babylon against the fact that a foreigner, Cyrus, is the anointed.[2] This suggestion seems very probable, especially since at the end in verse 13 reference is clearly made to Cyrus. Israel is not to question Yahwe about his salvatory work. There is no reward to Cyrus for the execution of Yahwe's will. Looking back at 43:3 we have another evidence that Ethiopia and Egypt are not given to Cyrus but are to be a ransom for Israel. There is no reward, says Yahwe of hosts (v.13).

---

[1] Cf. verse 8; also Psalm 85:10-11.

[2] Volz, Jesaja II, pp. 66-67.

Chapter 45, Verses 14-25. A new theme begins with verse 14. We do not assume any relationship to the preceeding verses. Verses 14-25 form an address to Zion.[1] Egypt, Ethiopia, and the men from Sheba shall come and serve Yahwe. Actually the verse says "shall pray to Zion", but immediately follows "with you alone is God and there is no other". Yahwe is with Zion. The foreigners praying before Zion surely pray before Yahwe. The hidden God is the saviour as over against the idols which can be seen and carried around (v.20); their impotence is a shame to their worshippers, for there is no salvation with them. Yahwe is the only saviour.

Yahwe is not a God of chaos. He created heaven and earth, forming them as a dwelling place. The pre-exilic cult mythology worshipped Yahwe in Baalized form as the victor over chaos. But there is no other God besides Yahwe. He formed his creation not as chaos. Nothing is said about any need to overcome chaos as a hostile power. Verse 19 seems to be spoken against the cult. Nothing is mysterious about Yahwe. His dabar is not a dabar revealed in secret and magic rites.

Verses 20-21 again form the argument against idols: can they prove that they are God? Have they prophesied and did what they prophesied actually happen?[2] The eschatological

---

[1] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 69.

[2] Isaiah 41:21ff.; 43:9ff. also.

reality of all nations worshipping Yahwe (v.22) leaves no room for the worship of idols. Yahwe refers to his dabar which was true and therefore never returned to him, meaning it will be effective and bear fruit.[1]

Deutero-Isaiah certainly has expected the divine salvatory act and the realization of the eschatological promise that all nations will soon look up to Zion and Yahwe. Verses 20-24 present completed universalism and constitute one of the prophetic climaxes of the Old Testament.[2]

---

[1] Isaiah 55:11 also.

[2] Verses 24b-25 seem to be an addition. They speak of Yahwe in the third person and do not belong to the preceeding verses. (Cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 73.) The confusion of Yahwe's foes stand against the triumph of Israel's descendants. These two verses make a narrow-minded impression compared to and coming after the grandiose prophetic proclamation in the preceeding verses.

Chapter 46

Chapter 46 seems to be a prophecy a short time before the fall of Babylon. All the precious idols are viewed as brought into captivity because they had no power to rescue themselves. Cyrus actually honored Nebo and Bel and they were not at all defeated as Deutero-Isaiah says here.[1] Bel and Nebo are the main gods of Babylon. Bel originally was a father god. His primacy was transferred to Marduk when Babylon became the center of the empire.[2]

The remnant of Israel or Jacob is addressed by the oracle. Yahwe bears the remnant. The shepherd metaphor stands probably in the background here.[3] Until old age Yahwe will bear Israel. Yahwe will continue with his salvatory actions: he will continue to give existence, to carry and to save (v.4). This is a quality which other gods do not have. To whom can Israel liken her God? The idols, no matter how much precious material is used to form them, are no competition for Yahwe. They show no reaction to the needs of their worshippers. They cannot answer and cannot save from distress. All rebellion is foolish when Israel considers that there is no other God but Yahwe (v.8).

The sentence 9b always is spoken with the same words.

---

[1] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 76.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Cf. also Isaiah 40:11; Exodus 19:4; Deuteronomy 32:11, where Yahwe is the eagle carrying his young ones.

Yahwe's uniqueness is proved through the events of history.[1] This message has almost dogmatic form in the proclamations of Deutero-Isaiah. The agent from the east, Cyrus, again is proof of Yahwe's sovereignty in history. The chapter ends with a reminder to the skeptics who cannot accept the possibility of salvation. In Israel the kabod of Yahwe will dwell. Its location, Zion, is the center of Yahwe's mercy.

The Zion ideology, where Zion is the navel of the earth and the dwelling place of Yahwe, is originally cultic. However, Deutero-Isaiah adheres to the prophetic tradition which treats Zion for what it is here in verse 13: the location of the kabod of Yahwe, an uncultic sanctuary, a symbol of the kingship of Yahwe. Just as it is Israel's glory to be the servant, which means to prove the sovereignty of Yahwe among the nations, thus Zion is the ideological term comprising servantship of Israel and kingship of Yahwe. This is accomplished, however, not through rites and rituals but the very existence of Zion and Israel. As Yahwe set a cloud to lead the way through the desert for Israel, now the kabod of Yahwe stands like a cloud on Zion as a leading sign for all nations.

---

[1] Cf. Isaiah 41:21ff.; 44:7; 45:21; 42:9.

Chapter 47

After announcing the downfall of the gods of Babylon, Deutero-Isaiah now gives an account of the downfall of the city itself. Babylon is likened to a lady, a cultured and spoiled woman. She said to herself "I am, there is none but me". Deutero-Isaiah here uses precisely the same formula that he usually uses to describe the sovereignty of Yahwe. Yahwe or Babylon: that is the question. And Babylon in her pride is humbled and made lowly. Yahwe takes vengeance for his servant Israel. No magic and art of divination shall help Babylon against Yahwe. All her skills are in vain (vv. 9-12). Astronomy and astrology are not able to help Babylon, the wise counselors are not even able to save themselves. The stars do not tell them their fate.

Chapter 48

Verses 1-16. Volz notes the sharp and radical nature of Deutero-Isaiah's address.[1] Certainly the whole people are attacked here. As he has done before, Deutero-Isaiah pronounces punishment for the apostasy of the people.[2] The general theme is the idolatry of pre-exilic Israel with reference to pre-exilic prophets (v.3). Deutero-Isaiah knows himself united with the prophets in his accusation of an obstinate people with a neck like an iron band.[3] Perhaps verses 1-11 are words delivered by Deutero-Isaiah at one of Israel's feasts, perhaps the feast of atonement.[4] The exiles apparently conduct a worship service which is not according to the will of Yahwe because it is a superficial service. Jerusalem is called a holy city as a symbol for the particular relationship between Yahwe and Israel. Yahwe's essence is holiness and true worshippers should not put their trust in or damage their relationship to the holy God by cultic actions and rites.[5]

Palestine had been called "holy mountain country",

---

[1] Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 87.

[2] Cf. vv. 4-12; Isaiah 42:24f.; 43:22ff.; 44:22.

[3] Cf. v.4; Exodus 32:9; Deuteronomy 9:6,27; Jeremiah 3:3.

[4] Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 88.

[5] Isaiah 44:5; also Staerk, *ZAW*, LV (1937), p. 18.

"holy dwelling place".[1] The country which Yahwe had promised the fathers and which Israel had occupied because of Yahwe's promise was "clean" country as over against the "unclean" land which designated the country around Israel.[2] Clean and unclean are cultic terms which designate that which does or does not belong to the service of a deity. Israel was the place where Yahwe was worshipped. Therefore it was "clean". Deutero-Isaiah seems to have limited the "holy mountain country" and the "holy dwelling place" to Jerusalem as the stronghold of the worship of Yahwe. Therefore he calls Jerusalem a holy city.[3]

Yahwe had foretold what he would do with this obstinate people. Did they think their idols brought such destruction (v.5) ?[4]

---

[1] Cf. Isaiah 11:9; Exodus 15:13.

[2] Amos 7:17; Hosea 9:3; Psalm 137:4; Ezekiel 4:13.

[3] This condensation of all Israel into Jerusalem may be due to the fact that Palestine was in the hands of other nations. Wide areas had a mixed population with only an Israelite minority. Even more important for the concept of Jerusalem as a holy city certainly was the Josianic reform which secularized the whole country by destroying the cult places and sanctuaries, not only of all foreign deities but also of Yahwe, and slaughtered the priesthood of those places. The holy city was the abode of Yahwe and the place where his kingship manifested itself (Isaiah 46:13). Here the nations shall come and bow down (Isaiah 52:12).

[4] Volz asks whether this question is directed toward the exiles or pre-exilic Israel. He decides that the latter was the case because he cannot believe that the exiles worshipped idols (Jesaja II, p. 89). However, if this be true it would be difficult to understand the emphasis which Deutero-Isaiah puts on the worship of idols (cf. 40:20; 41:6-7; 44).

The new which Deutero-Isaiah announces as following the destruction is as new a reality as the new covenant in Jeremiah. The proclamation of the complete new, however, stands against verses 9-10, where the prophet speaks of no radical end but of the destruction as a cleansing action.[1] The term creation for Yahwe's action points to all his work of salvation. Cleansing and deliverance from captivity makes Israel a new people and makes Israel the servant of Yahwe.[2] The particular salvatory significance of the name of Yahwe (v.9) has always been alive in Israel.[3] Through

---

We do not believe that the exiles worshipped idols as their fathers had done. They did something perhaps worse than that (cf. also Jeremiah 44). Again and again Deutero-Isaiah speaks about the proof of prophecy, saying that Yahwe is stronger than any idols; idols are really nothing because they are made by human hands. Yahwe had prophesied everything which happened to Israel through the mouth of his prophets. For Deutero-Isaiah this shows that it was Yahwe who punished Israel. The punishment is not a proof of Marduk's superiority over Yahwe. According to cultic ideology this would be so. This cultic ideology apparently was still very much alive in the minds of the exiles. They conceived of the exile, with the preceeding punishment and destruction of the temple, as the end, and this means the end of Yahwe also. Yahwe had been defeated. Deutero-Isaiah is addressing the exiles with the purpose of destroying their despair and skepticism. Here lies the reason for his attempt to prove the uniqueness and almightiness of Yahwe in history and creation. Because all destruction was the work of Yahwe there could be no thought that Yahwe had been defeated, in fact Yahwe is made even stronger and more powerful because he used Assyria, Babylonia, and now Persia to serve his purposes with his people.

[1] Verse 10 we read with M^{K} 245. K 440 and Volz (Jesaja II, p. 90) בְּחַנְתִּיךָ instead of בְּחַרְתִּיךָ. The connection of צרף and בחן appears also in Jeremiah 9:6; Psalm 17:3; 26:2; Deuteronomy 4:20; 1 Kings 8:51; Jer. 11:4.

[2] Cf. Isaiah 44:21; Danell, op. cit., p. 262.

[3] Cf. von Rad, Theologie..., p. 186.

his name Yahwe saves[1] and for his name's sake he helps.[2]

Verses 1-9 conclude with the doxology of Deutero-Isaiah, the proof of Yahwe's might. History and creation alike are the field of Yahwe's might (v.13ff.). Again we find the prophecy proof: who has foretold this? The answer, because obvious, is not given: I, Yahwe, have foretold all these things.[3] Yahwe is the one who called upon Cyrus to serve him and to fulfill the purpose of Yahwe with his people.[4]

Chapter 48, Verses 17-19. Yahwe appears as a teacher, teaching his will to his people. Yahwe, the teacher, is the same as Yahwe the גאל and קדוש.[5] The fruits of obedience would be the welfare of the people, and all promises which Yahwe made to the fathers[6] would be fulfilled. (v.19). The destruction would not have been necessary.

---

[1] Psalm 54:3 also.

[2] Psalm 23:3; 25:11; 143:11; Jeremiah 14:7; Isaiah 48:9.

[3] Isaiah 42:8f.; 44:7f.; 45:21; Jeremiah 28:16ff.

[4] Verse 16b is deleted by Budde and Kohler (Kohler, op. cit., p. 35). Volz deletes ורוחו at the end of v.16 among other deletions. It is true the ורוחו after the verb שלחני is impossible stylistically. All suggested translations do not make sense, neither "together with my spirit" nor the referring of the suffix in the verb to the prophet (cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 92).

[5] Cf. Isaiah 45:11.

[6] Genesis 22:17; cf. also 1 Kings 4:20; Hosea 2:1.

Chapter 48, Verses 20-22. For those who doubt that, in spite of the singular expressions used by Deutero-Isaiah when he speaks of the servant, the servant means the whole community, this text is clear evidence that the servant Jacob is the whole exiled community.[1] Deutero-Isaiah is so sure of the fall of Babylon that he encourages the exiles to flee the city. The whole earth shall hear the call of liberation. The second exodus becomes reality. This may explain the hymnic joy of v. 20. Volz is probably right in saying that the redemption of Israel, the second exodus which means a new birth, is considered by Deutero-Isaiah as the beginning of the eschatological events which will lead up to the re-institution of Israel in the country, the rebuilding of the holy city, and the realization of Yahwe's kingship on Zion and over the nations as a revealed reality.[2] Yahwe had been the king all along, but now the nations shall see him and his servant Israel.

Verse 21 depicts the events during the march through the desert when Yahwe will repeat his aid for his people, just as he had done during the first exodus.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Isaiah 41:8,9; 42:19; 43:10; 44:1,2,21,26; 45:4; 48:20; cf. Eissfeldt, Expository Times, XLIV (1932-33), p. 264.

[2] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 96.

[3] Cf. Exodus 17:6; Numbers 20:11. V.22 (parallel to 57:21) is to be deleted because it does not fit the context (cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 96). What has caused the insertion of this verse, which is also found in 48:22; 66:24 besides 57:21, cannot be recognized.

Chapter 49

Verses 7-26.[1] Verse 7 actually still belongs to the preceeding ebed song.[2] Lindblom interprets this verse as "accompanying word"[3] explaining the actual songs. We agree with Lindblom that verse 7 speaks about the servant, which is Israel. Among the Israelites the events of the past are felt to be insulting and shameful. Yahwe called and chose his servant, raising him out of humility and degradation to establish him in unknown glory.

Verses 8-13 depict the eschatological reality when Yahwe has liberated Israel and guided it through the desert in a marvelous and glorious way. Israel is now what it always was supposed to be: ברית עם (v.8b). This term emphasizes the essential and characteristic qualities of the ebed Israel, which is his importance and significance for the divine teleology of human history.[4] Verse 11 refers back to 40:3-5. The whole creation is asked to join in joy because Yahwe has comforted his people, has shown his mercy and his might.[5]

In opposition to these joyful sounds stands v. 14.

---

[1] Vv. 1-6 form an ebed song and are discussed later.

[2] Johannes Lindblom, "Die Ebed Jahwe-Orakel in der neuentdeckten Jesaja-Handschrift," ZAW, LXIII (1951), p. 236.

[3] This is true according to Lindblom, op. cit., also for Isaiah 42:5-9; 50:10-11; 52:13-53:1.

[4] Cf. Staerk, ZAW, LV (1937), p. 13.

[5] Cf. Isaiah 44:23.

There are still people among the exiles who cannot believe that Yahwe has forgiven, so will comfort and deliver them. We have heard before about the skepticism among the exiles regarding the might of Yahwe. This skepticism Deutero-Isaiah tries to destroy through the moving picture of Yahwe as a mother who could not possibly forget her sucking child (v.14). Yahwe has carved Israel on the palm of his hands. The dispersed will return. Numerous shall Israel become; there will be so many people that Zion will become too narrow for all the inhabitants. It is hard for Zion to believe that all these are her children. Kings and queens shall foster the dispersed children of Zion. They shall bring them back and humble themselves, even lick the dust off Zion's feet (v.23).

This will all be evidence that Yahwe is Lord. He is the one who makes the impossible possible. For human imagination it is impossible to take prey from the warrior and tyrant Babylonia and from all other nations who keep Israelites in captivity. "Yahwe is Lord" is the message Deutero-Isaiah wants to convey to the skeptics who cannot believe that Yahwe is not dead. Self-annihilation of enemies has become a common feature in later Jewish eschatology.[1] Yahwe is the אביר יעקב. The old name of the God of the fathers appears again here in Deutero-Isaiah.

---

[1] cf. Ezekiel 38:21; Haggai 2:22; Zechariah 14:13; Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 105.

The אביר is the redeemer (גאל) and saviour of Israel. The continuity of Yahwe's leading his people extends from the beginning ("I am the first and I am the last"[1]) to the end, when Yahwe will complete his history with his servant Israel/Jacob.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Isaiah 48:12.

[2] Cf. Isaiah 1:24.

Chapter 50

Verses 1-3. An oracle against Israel: the people should not think that Yahwe has surrendered them. A letter of divorce does not exist. According to ancient Hebrew law the husband legally had a superior position. A word from him was sufficient to pronounce divorce. Yahwe, thus says v.1, never spoke this word. No one has credit with Yahwe. Therefore there can be no talk of selling. Verse 1b apparently contradicts these facts. It says that Israel has been divorced.[1] The paradox, however, is solved when we consider the preceeding phrase: "because of your sins you are divorced". This says that Yahwe did not sever the bond. The people have to look for the severance in themselves. They were the ones to violate the covenant and forsake Yahwe.

Normally a woman could not divorce her husband, as we have indicated above. Israel's action is sinful in a double sense: first, she forsakes Yahwe and second, acts as if she had a letter of divorce. What Deutero-Isaiah tries to communicate here is a message which contains both salvation and judgment. Salvation because whatever Israel did Yahwe never spoke the word, which means the relationship always existed for Yahwe. It meant judgment because Yahwe never let the people go, which means he never let them out

---

[1] שלח is the technical term for divorce. Cf. Deuteronomy 24:1.

of their responsibility as a member of the covenant. Because they did not fulfill their covenantal responsibilities, judgment comes as punishment for their transgressions. Here in verse 1 the salvatory character of the relationship is certainly emphasized. This is indicated in the following verses.

In verse 2 Deutero-Isaiah apparently refers to the words of the prophets or to his own words. The people have no faith in the might of Yahwe. Verses 1-2 seem to be connected. The faith of Israel is too small, therefore they cannot believe that the relationship with Yahwe still exists. They are skeptical, they did not believe Yahwe's words, they did not trust in his power to liberate them. This is pious hypocrisy: when God does not act according to the rules of cult and dogma his actions are not acceptable as his actions. All they have to do now is to trust in Yahwe, who is committed to his people. As proof, Deutero-Isaiah again refers to the great deeds of Yahwe in nature. A god who has command over heaven and earth and sea certainly has power over nations and kings.[1]

---

[1] Verses 2b-3 reflect terminology of the chaos fight. Cf. also Isaiah 44:27; 51:9ff.; Rendtorff, ZTK, LXIII (1954), p. 4; Volz, Jesaja II, p. 108; cf. also for the scolding of Yahwe which dries the ocean Isaiah 17:13; Psalm 104:7; 106:9; for the darkening of the sky Exodus 10:21; Joel 3:4.

Chapters 51:1-52:12

Deutero-Isaiah addresses those who long for salvation.[1] Those who know what is right and have the teaching of Yahwe in their hearts form the eschatological, the ideal Israel. Again the prophet opposes the skepticism and small faith of the exiles, pointing to Abraham,[2] who was merely one and from whom Yahwe made a nation. Thus shall Yahwe make Zion a paradise.[3]

---

[1] Thus we translate צדק ; cf. v. 7a and Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 100.

[2] The mention of the first father, Abraham, indicates the strength of southern influence; among the strong northern influences are the frequent use of "Jacob " to denote Israel, and the kingship of Yahwe as an uncultic reality. The *bachar* covenant was connected with Abraham. The traditions about him were at home in the south. He was the recipient of the promise of the country and the father of a great nation (cf. Galling, *op. cit.*, p. 52 and Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 110). Dr. J.H. Otwell directed my attention to the interesting fact that Deutero-Isaiah, unlike the other prophets, must cope with pre-exodus traditions because Deutero-Isaiah assumes their immediate situation as parallel to pre-exodus conditions.

Volz points out the strange significance of the picture which Deutero-Isaiah is using here. That the Israelites are the descendants of Abraham and Sarah is connected with the idea of "Mother Earth" traces which we find elsewhere in the Old Testament. Men are born by a rock, or of a rock or cave. The idea that men are born from a tree (Erich Neumann, *The Great Mother* (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1955), plates *pp. 103-107*) or a spring forms a parallel (cf. Jeremiah 2:27). Here may lie the explanation for the "Stone of Israel" (Genesis 49:24) and for the divine name *shor*. In Deuteronomy 32:18 Yahwe is called the rock who generated Israel. The cult of mighty rocks also has its explanation here (cf. Volz, *Jesaja II*, pp. 110-11; North, *op. cit.*, p. 43.).

[3] Deutero-Isaiah returns here to a picture of ancient times. The end of time, the eschaton, touches with the beginning. Genesis 2:8; the country is which the garden of

Volz deletes verses 4-5 because they have no connection with the context.[1] Salvation is brought to the nations. No mediator is mentioned. Yahwe himself shall instruct them, not the servant, be it Israel or an individual. However, this does not seem to justify considering the verses an insertion in the present context. The preceeding verses apparently depict an eschatological reality. The conversion of the nations is a feature of this eschatological reality.[2]

The salvation of Yahwe even outlasts the creation. No power can reverse the salvatory purpose of Yahwe with his people (vv. 6-8). The destruction of the whole *kosmos* seems to be another feature of the eschatological renewal of the whole creation. Not only Israel experiences a new beginning, but apparently the whole *kosmos* is involved in the new beginning.[3] How much the creation of Israel and

---

Eden is located is paradise itself (Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 112). Verse 3b refers to Jeremiah 30:19. The words are similar. There also is connected the eschatological joy with the multiplication of the people.

[1] Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 114.

[2] Cf. Isaiah 42:5-7 and Østborn, *op. cit.*, p. 150. Østborn refers the universal significance of Jerusalem to the idea of Jerusalem as the navel of the earth. Yahwe is thought of as a king imparting *torah*. Another feature of Jerusalem/Israel, which is overlooked by Østborn, is the idea that light shall come into the darkness. The darkness refers to the nations which shall receive light through the servant Israel. The fact that the servant is not mentioned here in vv. 4-5 should not form an obstacle. The ideal is that Yahwe and servant are one. This unity, of course, is not a mystical unity but a unity of will and purpose.

[3] Isaiah 65:17; 66:12 explicitly speak of a new heaven and a new earth.

the creation of the world are related is revealed in verses 9-11.[1] Deutero-Isaiah refers here to the exodus from Egypt and to the march through the Sea of Reeds.[2]

The new exodus from Babylon signifies the beginning of a new time. Yahwe is the king, returning to Zion with his servant, whom he redeemed from Babylon.[3] Because Yahwe is a great God and a powerful, mighty God, Israel will not be afraid of mortal men. Why do you not trust in Yahwe, who is the creator of heavens and earth (vv. 12-16)? The fury of the oppressor soon shall end, and Israel, the crouching captive, shall not die.[4]

Verses 17-23 probably speak about Jerusalem during the siege after which the city was destroyed. This destruction

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie..., p. 142.

[2] Cf. Psalm 87:4; 114:1f.; Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 54; Rahab is a mythological term for Egypt. Cf. also Hempel, Gott und Mensch..., p. 62 and Gressmann, op. cit., p.1[illegible]4.

[3] Cf. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, p. 241 and Hempel, ZAW, LXV (1953), p. 131: we have here a contracted throne ascension myth which is historized by Deutero-Isaiah so far as the expected events shall take place in history, not in the cult. The kingship of Yahwe is established in Zion, visible to all nations. The eschatological reality of a new Israel and a new creation again are lifted out of their original cultic environment. The new is now not a proclamation by the cult and thus established through the rites of a New Years festival and throne ascension. The new is now a gift of Yahwe which has its origin in Yahwe's will for the salvation of his servant and does not have its origin in the cult.

[4] Verses 15-16 are considered incomprehensible by Volz (Jesaja II, pp. 126-7). The phrases all seem to be quotations; compare v. 15 with Jeremiah 31:35; 16a with Isaiah 59:21; Jeremiah 1:9; 16a with Isaiah 49:2; 16a with v.13; 16a reminds us of Hosea 2:25. The reason for this collection of quotations is obscure. Possibly it is an attempt to base the promise in v.14 on assurances of Yahwe's strength and care.

was a drink from the hand of Yahwe, a cup of fury. The men of the city are slain. No one is left to guide Jerusalem, which is depicted as an old woman. After the judgment, salvation is near. Yahwe has withdrawn the bowl of fury (v.22b). This cup shall be put into the hands of the Babylonians, who treat the exiles like slaves (v.23).

52:1-12 continue the depiction of salvation. Jerusalem is the holy city, the place where Yahwe dwells and where his _kabod_ is revealed to the nations. No uncircumcized or unclean one shall enter the holy place. Holy and unclean are opposites. What is holy excludes the unclean. The Babylonians may be the uncircumcized. Circumcision was the mark of Israel which distinguished her from the unclean environment during the exile.[1]

In verses 7-12 we have another throne ascension hymn. Yahwe the king is the center of these verses.[2] Heralds announce the ascension of Yahwe, Zion's king. This is the beginning of the eschatological kingdom, when Yahwe reigns over Zion. This event is extended into universal dimensions (v.10ff.). All nations shall see the

---

[1] Cf. Volz, _Jesaja II_, p. 120. Verses 3-6 are different in style. They are written in prose. Therefore they are deleted by Köhler, _op. cit._, p. 47. Volz, _Jesaja II_, p. 128, tries to maintain the text as Deutero-Isaianic through textual corrections. Remarkable is the frequency of "thus says Yahwe". The content gives a history of Israel's oppressions until Yahwe's _dabar_ ends all the oppressions of his people. For stylistic reasons we would have to agree with Köhler and give these verses to a redactor.

[2] Mowinckel, _Psalmenstudien_ ^{1}I, p. 292.

miracle on Zion, that Yahwe redeemed, restored, and saved Israel. Now it is the command of the hour to preserve this state. The vessels and investments of the cult are carried by the priests when they leave Babylon. As during the first march through the desert the cult instruments - then the ark carried by the Levites - march in the center of Israel.[1] Yahwe marches at the head of the exiles and at the end for complete protection.

---

[1] חפזון is the same word used for the exodus from Egypt and possibly is taken from the Passover liturgy of the exiles; cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 123; Exodus 12:11 and Deuteronomy 16:3.

Chapter 54

Verses 1-14. Verses 1-3 refer to Abraham and Sarah. Sarah the barren one could not conceive children until Yahwe promised her; then she bore a son and multiplied.[1] Yahwe 's promise to Abraham was descendants as numerous as the stars. This situation provides a parallel to Jerusalem, which is like Sarah (vv. 4-6). Like Sarah was with Hagar, who conceived a son by Abraham, so Jerusalem has to endure shame. But not for long. As the promise of Yahwe elevated Sarah over her maid Hagar, thus Yahwe will elevate Jerusalem (vv. 7-12). As certain as Yahwe will not bring any flood, so will he have pity with Jerusalem and will not return to his wrath.

The covenant with Yahwe will result in a new Jerusalem, a marvelous city. The eschatological city is depicted by Deutero-Isaiah as being built with jewels. The people do not need any priests or prophets. Yahwe himself shall teach them:[2] צדקה has established Jerusalem.[3]

---

[1] Genesis 15-18.

[2] This reminds us of the new covenant of Jeremiah (Ch. 31), which describes the new Israel in the same terms: Yahwe will put his instruction into the hearts of Israel.

[3] This term as always in Deutero-Isaiah does not mean righteousness. It rather is the term for fulfilled righteousness which we have described as a covenantal term. A zedekah relationship during the old covenant already had the connotation of salvation. Here in Deutero-Isaiah the term can be translated with salvation because the new

The security which is promised in verse 14 is affirmed in verses 15ff. Yahwe is the creator of weapons and therefore the Lord over all weapons (v.17). The passage ends with the certainty that nothing can harm Jerusalem.[1]

---

relationship between Yahwe and Israel is not a covenant any more; it is a mercy relationship. In other words it is Yahwe's zedekah which kept and keeps his promises to Israel (cf. Isaiah 53:17ff.; 51:1ff.; 50:1ff., etc.). Yahwe's zedekah, however, now means salvation as it had meant judgment before the exile (cf. especially Isaiah 50:1-3).

[1] It is remarkable that nowhere is said anything about the triumphs of Israel and about Israel's world rule. It is typical for Deutero-Isaiah that he speaks only of the security and protection of Jerusalem which is the work of Yahwe. The kingship of Yahwe is the main theme of Deutero-Isaiah. This kingship is manifest in creation and history, which are really one reality for Deutero-Isaiah. This is his prophetic heritage. For the prophets the first exodus marked the beginning of Israel's existence because it was the beginning of her relationship with Yahwe. Thus already there we may speak about creation although the pre-exilic prophets emphasize the historical character of the exodus event and the covenant resulting out of the encounter between Yahwe and Israel more than the creative factor of it.

Chapter 55

Verses 1-5. Deutero-Isaiah depicts the eschatological reality when all nourishment can be had without payment. That this really depicts an eschatological situation seems indicated by verse 2b: "listen to me, you shall eat what is good". If listening to the words of Deutero-Isaiah means a change of the present situation, then this can only mean that the prophet refers to the promise of Yahwe.[1] Yahwe will make an everlasting covenant with Israel. David is the example for the people. As he had been a witness of the strength of Yahwe to the nations, thus Israel shall witness to the kabod of Yahwe.[2]

Verses 6-13. The one who wants to have a relationship with the near God must repent. Yahwe shall forgive a repentent sinner. How much Yahwe is different from men again may be a word against skepticism of some of the exiles, who had a preconceived notion about what Yahwe was and is.

---

[1] Against Volz, Jesaja II, p. 138, who separates verses 1-3 from 4-5 and denies any eschatological significance. According to Volz the prophet says: do not set your heart on earthly goods but long for the transcendental, the eternal. However, there is no reason why such "primitive" things like the daily bread in abundance should not belong to the eschatological reality. The prophet hardly considered this reality as metaphysical a situation as Volz interprets it.

[2] Cf. Bentzen, King and Messiah, p. 63, who interprets the servant as the messianic king. Therefore, he concludes, the servant must be identified with an heir of the house of David because David is mentioned here in Chapter 55. He must

This picture of Yahwe really is an idol because it is made by man, by man's imagination and cult dogma. When a nation is defeated the god of this nation is dead. But Yahwe is far beyond everything man is able to understand, or comprehend. He is the power effective in nature. Yahwe's word is as effective as the powers of nature. Spoken, it never returns fruitless. It always fulfills its purpose. Yahwe had spoken and it had happened. Who of the idols could claim this?[1] The joy about the marvelous march and return through the desert awakes all of nature.[2] Like the servant, thus also nature is a witness to the power of Yahwe.

---

be considered a son of David, a real person, as the Jews in 520-16 B.C. celebrated Zerubbabel as Messiah. This identification or interpretation, however, does not account at all for the association of the servant in Deutero-Isaiah as Israel/Jerusalem/Jacob. We still have to discuss the identity of the servant, but at least it should be said that 55:3 cannot bear the weight of the argument since David here clearly appears as an example: "as David then... you shall now..." (v.5).

[1] For the dabar of Yahwe see Isaiah 40:8; 9:7; Psalm 147:15.

[2] Cf. Isaiah 44:23; 49:13; also Psalm 96:11-13.

The *Ebed* Songs in Deutero-Isaiah

Isaiah 42:1-7 (1-9).[1] Bentzen interprets verses 1-3 as enthronement of the king in the sanctuary in Jerusalem.[2] He understands the servant as an individual.

---

[1] Lindblom, *op. cit.*, p. 235, considers as *ebed* oracles 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 53:2-12. Accompanying words to these *ebed* songs are 42:5-9; 49:7; 52:13-53:1. He understands the accompanying words as interpretations of the actual *ebed* songs. They were connected with the songs from the beginning and should not be separated from them.

Volz, *Jesaja II*, with Duhm, following a suggestion of Ewald, treat the *ebed* songs separately from the rest of Deutero-Isaiah. Ewald suggested that passages 42:1-7; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12 are remnants of a different work on the basis of style, language, and metre. They have no connection with the context and it is possible to remove the songs without leaving a gap, and finally on the basis that a disparity exists between what is said concerning the servant in the different servant songs and in the context of the servant songs (cf. Eissfeldt, *Expository Times*, XLIV (1932-33), p. 262 and Richard Press, "Der Gottesknecht im Alten Testament," *ZAW*, LXVI (1955), p. 67). Whether this is true, the present investigation shall try to show. We reject the separation of the *ebed* songs from the rest of the book of Deutero-Isaiah. They are treated separately here merely for convenience sake. If the disparity between the servant in the actual songs and the servant in Chapters 40-55 can only be removed through violent textual operations, the result as to the identity of the servant misconstrued. Why should the final redactors of Deutero-Isaiah combine songs, which speak more or less in individual terms about the servant, with a work which conceived the servant apparently as a collective? The popular idea in later Judaism certainly was a Messiah who was an individual.

Following Lindblom, we shall not separate the accompanying words from those verses which Lindblom considers the actual *ebed* songs, and shall try to treat accompanying words and actual *ebed* songs as a whole. For a summary of the problem involved, see Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, pp. 48-67, Walther Zimmerli and Joachim Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957), pp. 9-34, Sigmund Mowinckel, *Der Knecht Jahwäs* (Giessen; Töpelmann, 1921)

[2] Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, p. 19.

Engnell goes further than Bentzen.[1] Deutero-Isaiah is a prophetic collection of liturgical traditions which have been changed. The original purpose of these traditions lies in the cult, while Deutero-Isaiah only imitates the cult liturgy by filling it with another content, and thus giving it quite a different significance.

Elements of the enthronement liturgy we find all through the book of Deutero-Isaiah. The _ebed_ songs especially make use of this liturgical form, which is also found in Psalm 110:[2] the enthronement (v.1), the investiture (v.2), acclamation (v.3), the ordination as priest (v.4), the promise of victory over enemies (vv. 5-6), and the sacramental cup of water from the holy well. Another element of the New Years enthronement festival is the ritual combat between God and the powers of chaos, which we discovered in its demythologized form (Yahwe is the Lord of his creation because he is the creator; we hear nothing of a fight) and in its historized form (the deliverance from Egypt/Rahab in Isaiah 51:9, as now from Babylon). For Deutero-Isaiah the enthronement of Yahwe takes place in history before the eyes of all nations. The servant is witness and symbol for Yahwe's deeds. The servant is the means by which Yahwe glorifies himself.

---

[1] Bentzen, _King and Messiah_, pp. 64-65.

[2] _Ibid._, pp. 23-24.

Applying the enthronement scheme to Deutero-Isaiah, we have to notice that all strictly ritual features of the liturgy are avoided and left behind. Furthermore, we have to consider that the servant is not to be enthroned. It is Yahwe who is to be enthroned because he is *the* king, there is no other. The enthronement of Yahwe for Deutero-Isaiah is of course not a ritual act, but takes place in the events through which Yahwe, liberating his people and humbling nations, proves his sovereignty. What Yahwe therefore does with his servant is a reflection. The actions of Yahwe reflect the purpose of Yahwe with his creation, - which as discussed includes nature and history - proclaimed, witnessed to, and symbolized by Yahwe's servant.

When Yahwe upholds his servant and chooses Israel, this small and defeated one among all nations (42:1a), he proves that he is king. This corresponds to the enthronement of the earthly king, who also is enthroned as servant of his god and is endowed with the sign of kingship, the scepter.[1] The servant in Deutero-Isaiah is endowed with the משפט of Yahwe. Thus invested as servant, he receives the office or purpose of his servantship: he shall bring משפט to the nations (v.1).[2]

---

[1] Cf. Psalm 110:2.

[2] The term משפט is translated by Volz, *Jesaja II*, p. 153, as truth. The reason for this translation for Volz is that משפט, which means religion in Isaiah 51:4, or law in 40:14, includes a number of meanings like the

Who are those to whom Deutero-Isaiah refers as those who cry and shout in the streets? Does he think of the prophets of doom or of the ecstatic *nebiim*? Perhaps he has no particular persons in mind at all. 42:2 simply explains the way in which the servant shall bring to the nations. He proclaims without raising his voice. Perhaps the prophet wants to go so far as to say: the servant does not speak at all. The presence of the servant among the nations is alone sufficient witness to the of Yahwe. He is even so cautious that he takes care of the "flickering wick" and the "bent reed"(v.3).

It is in faithfulness that the servant shall bring משפט to the gentiles (coastlands).[1] The quality of faithfulness was lacking in Israel and among its kings. The servant is what Israel was supposed to be, faithful. The servant is to establish the right of Yahwe (משפט) among the nations. The right of Yahwe is his lordship. The gentiles expect the *torah* of Yahwe. This is the fulfillment of history.

Verses 5-9 make it difficult to consider them in connection with the preceeding verses. We have to agree

---

Arabian *din* and the Greek ὅδος . The meanings religion and law perhaps mark the limits of the meaning of משפט. Therefore a word should be found which includes a variety of what משפט can denote. For Volz truth is this word. Gesenius, *op. cit.*, p. 473, translates משפט for this passage with divine right. We will have both meanings in mind when we speak of משפט as the central proclamation of the servant.

[1] Gesenius, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

with Volz and treat verses 5-9 as a separate song which is connected with the first through the motif of the servant.[1] In verse 5 Yahwe's might is established over nature and man. From him they have their life and breath. This strength gives Yahwe the "right" to call the servant.[2]

In the Assyrian enthronement liturgy the king takes the hand of the god.[3] In Deutero-Isaiah it is vice-versa: Yahwe takes the hand of his servant. This difference is significant for the distinction of a "free" God and a cultic deity. Yahwe acts in his sovereignty when he takes the servant by his hand, binding the servant to himself and investing him in his office to be a light to the nations and open the eyes of the blind.[4]

---

[1] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 154.

[2] The word here is not משפט but צדק. The first is more comprehensive, the second a more intense term (see our discussion of צדק in Chapter 54 of Isaiah). Zedekah is associated with the covenant. A relationship in "righteousness" means salvation. It, however, can also mean destruction when the covenant is violated. Yahwe as creator (v.5) has the divine right (משפט) to his creation. Yahwe as engaged in a covenant is צדק and acts in this צדק quality with one whom he calls into this covenant. That here in v.6 the covenantal quality is emphasized is proved by v.6b, which speaks of the servant as ברית עם (covenantal people).

[3] Bentzen, King and Messiah, p. 22.

[4] Isaiah 42:18-19 is commonly not considered a servant song; nevertheless something is said about the servant. Clearly Israel is here the servant which is accused of being blind and deaf. However, this Israel is a messenger of Yahwe. What is the relationship between the servant who is blind and deaf himself (vv. 18-19)? There does not necessarily exist a contradiction between

The necessity for revision of the cult formula, which Deutero-Isaiah probably knew, came because of the uncultic character of the message of Deutero-Isaiah.[1] It shows that Deutero-Isaiah did not think that there was anyone who could grasp the hand of Yahwe. He was convinced, however, that Yahwe was the one to extend his hand as he had done when he led Israel out of Egypt, which also was a free action, an election, of Yahwe. The object, Israel, had no natural quality. The same is true now. The cult could not and cannot lead them out of slavery; it needed more than an idol, to speak the language of Deutero-Isaiah, who rejected the strength of all idols. The purpose of the ברית עם (v.6) certainly is to extend the covenant, which is relationship with Yahwe, to the nations, which live in a prison called darkness. This is the eschatological reality, a new world which the might of Yahwe shall bring about.[2]

---

the two passages. The first one depicts the eschatological reality with the servant truly fulfilling his functions among the nations. The second passage is directed to the everyday reality of the life of the exiles. Deutero-Isaiah tries to encourage them, and tries to remove their skepticism. In spite of all that happened, Israel is still the servant of Yahwe, especially since Deutero-Isaiah is looking forward into the glorious future when Yahwe and his servant shall be united. The unworthiness and weakness of the blind and deaf servant for his service only underlines the lordship of Yahwe, who is able to work even through such a servant.

[1] Cf. also Staerk, ZAW, LV (1937), p. 13.

[2] Cf. also Widengren, *op. cit.*, p. 58; for the parallel of first creation and second creation see Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien*, II, p. 282.

Isaiah 49:1-7. In these verses the servant describes himself. Nations at the far ends of the world are his listeners; the whole world is his audience. Verse 1b is the authorization of the servant: Yahwe has called him,[1] and has called him by his name.[2] The servant is depicted as a prophet. His mouth proclaims the dabar of Yahwe.[3] Sword and arrow are metaphors which characterize the activity of the servant. From his mother's womb Yahwe concealed the servant, let him grow up, until the right moment, the kairos arrived, when Yahwe drew the arrow and took the sword to use them for his glory.[4]

Verse 4 is looking back at the disastrous history of Israel when Israel, the servant did not fulfill the function of a servant. Now the servant puts his right, his משפט on Yahwe. This means two things: first, that the servant surrenders his own right and admits that he has none, and secondly, that Yahwe's right is the right of the servant. This means Deutero-Isaiah is speaking

---

[1] Cf. Isaiah 42:1.

[2] For this phrase known from Babylonian court terminology see Isaiah 45:4; 43:1 and the discussion of the phrase there. Cf. also Gressmann, op. cit., p. 60.

[3] Cf. Grether, op. cit., p. 133.

[4] Cf. Jeremiah 1:7. "Israel" usually is omitted (cf. Volz, Jesaja II, p. 151) because the good version M^{K96} does not have it. Possibly v.3 is influenced through its similarity to 44:23 (cf. also Köhler, op. cit., p. 37). We follow the canonical text and accept "Israel" which even if an addition is good interpretation.

of a unity of will between Yahwe and his servant. The commission of the servant is clear (v.5). Jacob shall return to Yahwe. This can mean both the actual return to Palestine and the inward return to Yahwe.[1] The office of the servant is extended (v.6). It is not enough that he shall bring home the exiles, but he also shall be a light to the nations and a bearer of Yahwe's salvation to them.

Verse 7 comments on the universal salvation. Although the servant is meek and despised by men, a slave of rulers, and apparently completely unable to fulfill the task which he is supposed to, in the eschatological reality the roles will be reversed. Kings and princes will humble themselves before the servant for Yahwe's sake. Yahwe has chosen Israel, so he is the goel and the kadosh; in his faithfulness he restores his servant because of his lordship.

Isaiah 50:4-11. This song has its object also clearly in Israel or the exiles. The servant is a disciple with a message to comfort the tired.[2] Yahwe awakens the ear of the servant every day anew to receive the command of Yahwe, his dabar. As it was the function of the newly enthroned king to bring the gospel to the weary, freedom to the imprisoned, and comfort to the mourning,[3] the servant

---

[1] Volz, Jesaja II, p. 159.

[2] Sometimes this ebed song is understood as autobiographical.

[3] Widengren, op. cit., p. 57.

has the same message for the people. However, his message is not a message of _a_ king which would have no authority, it is the message of Yahwe _the_ king. Deutero-Isaiah again and again speaks, proclaims, proves the kingship of Yahwe in nature and history just for this purpose: to comfort the weary, to convince the skeptics, and to enlighten the blind. Again in Deutero-Isaiah this is not a cultic act but something happening in history. Yahwe is proving his might among the nations, and Israel is his witness.

For the first time in Deutero-Isaiah we meet in verses 6-9 the suffering servant. This is the servant who is true to the role in which Yahwe invested him (v.5). The servant is not rebellious. He stays with his task. Again let us look at the role of the king in the New Years enthronement festival: the king has to suffer. This is demanded by the periodical changes of life. If life is seen in historical perspectives and when the periodical changes of life are substituted by the will of Yahwe, the one who brings salvation has to suffer.[1] As the king in his role in the New Years festival suffers as representative of the corporate whole, thus the servant in Deutero-Isaiah suffers as representative of the corporate whole. Servant is the opposite of king and in the New Years

---

[1] Cf. van der Leeuw, _op. cit._, p. 131.

festival the king adopts the role of the servant.[1]

The suffering in Deutero-Isaiah is torn out of its cultic frame and now becomes the explanation of Yahwe's history with Israel. This is the only explanation of what happened. If the destruction is Yahwe's deed, then Yahwe is not dead as many wanted to believe. Rather the contrary, the destruction is a sign for the sovereignty of Yahwe, who has chosen this people from among all nations but is not limited to it. He is the Lord of nature and history. The suffering of the servant Israel had a purpose and Yahwe is about to reveal this purpose.

In verse 10 the servant turns to the nations, to those who walk in darkness. This may include the skeptics and faithless in Israel, but mainly the nations are addressed here.[2] Those who come with burning arrows shall die by the fire which they have kindled.[3]

Isaiah 52:13-53:12.[4] In verses 52:13-15 Yahwe

---

[1] Cf. van der Leeuw, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

[2] Cf. Isaiah 45:19; 51:4; 9:1ff.

[3] Verses 10-11 usually are considered late. Volz, *Jesaja ^{I}I*, p. 162, says they are too general in comparison with the rest of the text (v.10) and too terse (v.11), while Köhler, *op. cit.*, p. 43, considers v.10 as questionable and rejects verse 11. If vv. 10-11 are to be rejected, we find no reference to the servant in this song.

[4] We do not intend to go into the very problematic textual situation of these passages. The text is garbled in many places and scholars always have tried to re-establish the original text without any success. (For the textual problem cf. Volz, *Jesaja ^{I}I*, pp. 170-1.) We have to deal

presents his servant. The word רבים appearing the first time in this poem in verse 14 forms a contrast to the one, the ebed.[1] Indeed it is an exciting thing: kings shall turn silent when they look at the fate of the ebed. Something completely new shall be revealed to them.

In 53:1 the speaker changes. It is not Yahwe any longer, but the people or the poet speak the words. In the poem 52:13-53:12 Deutero-Isaiah again makes use of liturgical traditions taken from the New Years festival,[2] and transforms it into a song about the servant of Yahwe. This was performed the more easily because the king in Jerusalem, as in Babylon and Egypt, was considered a servant of the deity, a representative, and an official.[3] Remarkably enough, we find a similar picture of the servant in Deutero-Isaiah 53 also in Psalm 22. Except for the idea of substitute suffering, the ebed of Psalm 22 is identical with the one in Isaiah 53.[4] The one who prays in Psalm 22 stands in the focus of the public. His suffering and praying does

---

with the Masoretic text as Kittel, Biblia Hebraica (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937) offers it, and try to understand the ebed passages in Chapters 52 and 53 on the basis of that text.

[1] Cf. רבים in Isaiah 52:15; 53:11,12a,12b.

[2] Cf. Bentzen, King and Messiah, p. 57, also the "newness" in 52:15 with Psalm 96:1; 98:1; 149:1, the "new song". Cf. also Engnell, Bulletin..., XXXI (1948), p. 57.

[3] Refer to the previous section on the monarchy.

[4] Press, ZAW, LXVI (1955), p. 79.

not take place in a hidden place.[1] The forensic element also is clear in Psalm 22.[2]

Engnell likens the servant of Isaiah 53 to Tammuz, whose body in Ras Shamra, corporalized in the shape of the earth, was symbolically maltreated and ploughed under.[3] However, Tammuz is stricken by leprosy. Engnell also emphasizes the vicarious suffering (53:4) in the New Years festival which is a result of the corporate solidarity where the king atones for the sin of the people. This is a feature common to sacral kingship all over the ancient Near East. The shepherd metaphor also is a feature of Tammuz and the sacral king (v.6).[4]

Some other features of the servant should be emphasized before we launch into the question of the identity of the servant. Although he was innocent, the servant died. We know of the cultic death of the king in the ritual of the New Years festival. The servant was buried with evildoers (vv. 8-9). Everything that happened to him came from the hand of Yahwe. The servant belonged to the faithless

---

[1] Cf. Psalm 22:17.

[2] Cf. Psalm 22:23 and Press, ZAW, LXVI (1955), p. 82.

[3] Engnell, Bulletin..., XXXI (1948), pp. 82-85.

[4] We meet the lamb as sacrificial substitute for "Tammuz" the king both among east and west Semites (Mari, Ras Shamra). In the Sumero-Accadian Tammuz liturgies are repeatedly found such expressions of Tammuz as "the lamb carried off to the steppe...", "The lamb taken away to the underworld...", etc. (cf. Engnell, Bulletin..., XXXI (1948), p. 84.

and gave his life for many. However, there is an end to the suffering and the servant shall see light (v.11) after he has brought salvation.[1] Unless we understand the death of the servant and his "resurrection" symbolically, that means cultically, the servant cannot be an individual. The whole context of Deutero-Isaiah rules out the cultic interpretation. Furthermore, there was no king who possibly could have fulfilled the role of the servant. Death and "resurrection" of the servant are only consistent with the rest of Deutero-Isaiah when we understand the servant as a collective entity.

---

[1] צדק ; Cf. the discussion of this term under Chapter 54.

The Identity of the Servant

To begin with we shall not separate the rest of the book of Deutero-Isaiah from the ebed songs when it is our purpose to find out the identity of the servant. Considering the context of the whole book the ebed would be Israel.[1]

We have a twofold characterization of the ebed in Deutero-Isaiah. First we see the ebed as he actually is, or as a part of him is in the present situation. The servant is depicted as being blind and deaf.[2] The former transgressions are clearly seen.[3] Deutero-Isaiah exhorts the skeptics and those of little faith to trust in Yahwe. The prophet tirelessly tries to prove to the exiles the might of Yahwe and tries to convince them of the assurance of deliverance. This is one side of Israel. The other is the eschatological reality. Here the ebed is a faithful functionary of Yahwe, fulfilling the task laid upon him to proclaim the glory and kingship of Yahwe among the nations.[4] The ebed has a commission to Israel and yet is distinguished from her.[5] This would point to an ideal Israel. For

---

[1] Cf. Isaiah 41:5ff. and other passages whenever Jacob, Abraham, and Israel are mentioned as chosen or as servant.

[2] Cf. Isaiah 42:18-19.

[3] Cf. Isaiah 44:21ff.

[4] Cf. Isaiah 40:9-11, 27-31; 41:1-4, 5-16, etc, and all ebed songs.

[5] Cf. Isaiah 49:5-6.

Mowinckel the distinction between an ideal and a real Israel does not concur with the thought of Israel and of the Old Testament.[1] Eissfeldt says that the ideal Israel is a good probability. When corporate names like Jacob or Abraham are used, the ideal Israel is implied. Israel

> "was quite familiar with the conception of an ideal entity which present in the particular social group at any given time, is nevertheless over and above it, and, while identical, is yet different."[2]

H. Wheeler Robinson decides that the ebed is the nation Israel "in its world-mission making known the religion of Yahwe".[3] Some have argued that Cyrus is the ebed. Here, however, the feature of the suffering of the ebed does not fit. The person of Cyrus as ebed is out of the question. He was not a believer in Yahwe, as Deutero-Isaiah clearly states. His servantship was a temporary affair. Is the ebed David redivivus? The title servant was a Canaanite royal title which via Jerusalem came to be adopted for the Davidic kings of Jerusalem.[4] Bentzen refers to the view point of Engnell, who says that the ebed is the Messiah.[5] Was the ebed a king at all? The titles of the servant in Deutero-Isaiah surely point to a royal figure:

---

[1] Cf. Eissfeldt, Expository Times, LXIV (1932-33), p.266.

[2] Ibid., p. 267.

[3] H. Wheeler Robinson, The Cross in the Old Testament (London: SCM Press, 1955), p. 98.

[4] Cf. Bentzen, King and Messiah, p. 47.

[5] Ibid., p. 49.

servant, Messiah, chosen. A king from the house of David would be another possibility for the servant. He would have to be an ideal king very much in the fashion that the prophets pictured the charismatic king. The _ebed_ is an official of Yahwe, not more and not less. However, this assumes that Deutero-Isaiah assumed the return and revival of the Davidic monarchy. Deutero-Isaiah seems to have been prophet enough not to have an ideal picture of the Davidic monarchy. Thus he stands in the prophetic tradition. David is mentioned only once, in 55:3, a text which bears no reference to the renewal of the Davidic kingship. Furthermore, we have observed throughout the book of Deutero-Isaiah that the central ambition of Deutero-Isaiah is to proclaim the establishment of the kingship of Yahwe. The kingship of Yahwe and the kingship of a king from the house of David do not go together for the prophetic mind.

The strongest argument against a Davidic king is that we assume that the characteristics of the _ebed_, although depicting an eschatological reality, nevertheless refer to historical events when they speak about the servant as suffering and being commissioned to be a witness and symbol of the _kabod_ of Yahwe; we would find no member of the royal dynasty who would fulfill this role. It is true Jehoiachin suffered, and perhaps this suffering was understood as vicarious, but he still does not fulfill the other conditions. He could not lead the people back and he surely was no

witness for the glory of Yahwe, a new creation and a light to the nations.

Another possibility for the identity of the servant would be a prophet, perhaps Deutero-Isaiah himself. We do not know the name of the prophet called Deutero-Isaiah, and we know no name of any prophet who could have fulfilled the role prescribed for the servant. It is difficult to conceive that the Old Testament record would not have preserved one notice about such an important personality as a prophet who was the ebed. The servant is called Jacob/Israel outside the actual ebed songs. This also speaks against a prophet as the ebed.[1]

All interpretations which consider the ebed as an individual have to separate the ebed songs from the rest of the book and have to delete "Israel" in 49:3. The strongest argument can be made for a corporate interpretation of the servant.

The question now is, was ebed a title for the whole Israel or only for a part of it? Reviewing the descriptions which Deutero-Isaiah offers about Israel, we find that there were people among the exiles who did not believe in national revival and had adjusted to the new environment.[2] It is our thesis that the holy remnant is the ebed of

---

[1] Cf. Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), pp. 250ff. Mowinckel considers the ebed as a prophet from the same circle as the author of the songs. Naturally Mowinckel separates ebed songs from 40-55.

[2] Isaiah 49:14ff.; 40:18ff.; 50:10f.; 42:18ff.

Deutero-Isaiah.[1] Those who belonged to the righteous remnant were innocent and righteous but they went into exile with the rest of the people, and were as struck by the complete destruction as everyone else. That the suffering of the righteous was something Israel learned through the destruction we know from Jeremiah, Lamentations,

---

[1] We find for the remnant the same twofold significance which we discovered for the terms משפט and צדק. All three terms include both judgment and salvation. The last term, remnant, is the most radical of them. As the servant is Yahwe's "divine right" (משפט) and his righteousness (צדקה), thus the remnant is Yahwe's divine right, his property among the nations.

The remnant is that which escaped or went through the judgment. Salvation and judgment clearly are combined. In the "concept" of the remnant we find three lines meeting which already formed the prophetic proclamations in a threefold way: 1)the complete destruction of the people of Yahwe 2) the salvation which Yahwe shall bring to the people, and 3) the possibility of repentence for Israel, which means to seek Yahwe (cf. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch...*, IV, p. 203). The relationship of those three lines is established through the reality of the remnant. In the remnant salvation and destruction become a unity. A look at Isaiah may help us to comprehend the intensity of the remnant. In Ch. 6 call and remnant are combined, also through the combination of Ch. 6-7. The remnant has its origin where the prophets have their origin: in the coming of Yahwe into his world where he reveals himself as the holy to man. According to Isaiah 6 this coming means death. Killing the sin, it proves to be salvation at the same time. What is true for the individual Isaiah is also true for all Israel: the election of Israel has its root in the coming of Yahwe.

That the remnant is a worldly reality is shown in Micah 5:6,7. Yahwe creates the remnant: Isaiah 1:8,9. In Yahwe the remnant has its existence: Isaiah 7:3. The remnant will be a new creation, as indicated through the metaphor of the seed: Isaiah 11:1,12,16; 28:5; 4:2ff.; 37:32; 28:16-18. That the remnant has its existence in Yahwe alone is indicated through the fact that the remnant appears in proclamations of total destruction (cf. also Fichtner, *ZAW*, LXIII (1951), p. 29).

Trito-Isaiah, and Job.[1]

That Deutero-Isaiah adopted the liturgical pattern of the New Years festival is easily comprehensible. For a prophet the king was the chosen of Yahwe, the anointed, and a servant. Through the Jerusalem cult these features became Canaanized and others were added, such as the idea of the king representing the corporate whole and the suffering of the king in the New Year's festival. Deutero-Isaiah combined the prophetic ideal of the king with the things the cult had to say, and used this combination of titles and functions to explain the role of the servant.

At the same time Deutero-Isaiah wanted to emphasize the new, the beginning of the eschatological reality. This meant the proclamation that Yahwe was king universal. The functions which originally the king had fulfilled in the cult, as well as those the charismatic king had performed, were transformed. The Messiah is Yahwe in Israel. The king, being the anointed, was the representative of Yahwe among his people, and therefore a servant of the purposes of Yahwe. The king was chosen, invested, and elevated after he experienced ritual death in the cult in Jerusalem.

Deutero-Isaiah widened the circle of Israel, with the king as representative of the corporate whole in the center, into the universal. The center of the circle now

---

[1] Cf. Jeremiah 11:19; 15:10; 20:14-28; Lamentations 3; Isaiah 61; 65.

is not the king because there is no king. The circle was formed by the nations, and in the center as representative of the corporate whole stood the remnant, those who returned in a second exodus from Babylon. The remnant fulfills the functions of the king, being a true servant and official with only the purpose of being a witness and symbol of the might of Yahwe, who had chosen the meek and made it great in spite of all human probabilities. Deutero-Isaiah realized the prophetic ideal of the absolute kingship of Yahwe because it was the only way out of the dilemma.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

During the historical process of gradual invasion into Canaan, the nomadic elements came in contact with the culture and religion of the country they invaded. The nomads worshipped deities which distinguished themselves decisively from deities worshipped by the Canaanites. The "terror of Isaac" and the "strong one of Jacob" were such nomadic deities. As their names suggest, these deities were recognized through the people by whom they were worshipped. In other words, the nomadic deities were necessarily connected with people, group, clan, or tribe instead of being connected to a certain place, as were the Canaanite deities.

The nomadic deities were thus of a nomadic character themselves, mobile, coming and going. The nomadic elements changed their sociological structure after they settled in Canaan. This process brought them in close contact with the Canaanites, whose way of life, that of an agricultural society with strong trading ambitions, they tried to adopt. This sociological change from a nomadic to a settled, agricultural society, influenced their beliefs because the nomadic deities were not competent for the new necessities and categories of settled life. Canaanite deities began to

be worshipped, Baal, Asherah, El, and sometimes their traditions merged with those of the gods of the fathers.

The nomadic elements which invaded Canaan belonged to the great movement of the Habiru, members of which we find all over the ancient Near East. These nomadic elements which invaded Canaan later formed what we commonly call Israel. Directly responsible for the existence of Israel was the covenant, which formed the basis of the strong bonds among the "tribes". "House Joseph" had come from Egypt, and in connection with the Levites they probably brought the service of Yahwe to Canaan. The Levites had been Yahwe priests at Kadesh, the great nomadic cult place where the fugitives from Egypt, Ephraim and Manasseh (house Joseph) had camped for several years. Certainly Ephraim and Manasseh were nothing more than nomadic Habiru elements. Their names, as probably all other names of the Israelite tribes, are of late origin, that is they refer to locations or occupations of the tribes in the country of Canaan.

Yahwe had showed his relationship to the fugitives from Egypt when he protected them against their pursuers and assisted them on their journey through the desert. The initial covenantal partners, Ephraim and Manasseh as well as the Levites, made a covenant at Shechem among themselves with Yahwe and then with other groups of the same origin as was theirs, like Dan, Asher, Benjamin, etc., and understood the saving action of Yahwe as the first covenantal act of

their God. Here we have the beginning of a unique phenomenon: a god-man relationship that was not established through some kind of cultic action, but through a historical experience. Faithfulness and righteousness, as documented in the old nomadic apodictic law, were the basis of the covenant. Yahwe was a full member of the covenant, subject to its commandments as much as any other member. This covenant lifted Israel out of the circle of nations as something particular. Israel was a holy nation, separated from the nations to the service of Yahwe. No other deity was to be worshipped. Yahwe demanded an exclusive relationship.

Through the centralization of worship in Jerusalem the struggle between Levitical Yahwism and cultic religion, as represented by the Canaanite Jerusalem cult, came to its climax. The everlasting covenant between Yahwe and David was one of the many elements of Jerusalem tradition which influenced Israelite faith. The everlasting covenant or *bechar* relationship was a cultic reality in which Yahwe really was removed from direct influence upon his people and had to employ the mediation of the king, who was almost a divine figure.

Except for the prophets, the Levites certainly were the strongest Yahwistic and therefore the most anti-monarchical force in Israel. They stood in opposition to the monarchy and to Jerusalem ever since David had taken

the ark to Zion and had surrendered it to the care of the Zadokites, the original Canaanite Jebusite priesthood which David left in priestly position when he conquered the city. The Levites had been the bodyguard of the ark and carried the ark in holy wars. The ark was the symbol of the presence of Yahwe Sabaoth, who was the God of holy war and the leader of the Israelite militia in these wars. Thus Levites and holy war were closely connected. The holy war was proclaimed when one or several members of the covenantal amphictyony were threatened by an enemy. Sometimes the instrument of holy war could even be used to exterminate guilt in Israel, as in the case of the war against Benjamin. Pieces of meat were sent to the tribes as a sign for the beginning of holy war. These wars were strictly covenantal functions. Yahwe participated, leading his people in the form of the ark, fighting for his people. The term "ark" probably is a Canaanite term, descriptive of the peculiar shape of the nomadic cult object which is to be identified with the tent of meeting. The Canaanites did not understand the shape and thus the function of the tent of meeting, especially since the settlement deprived the tent of meeting of its nomadic character; it was no longer used in the old way. Perhaps the carrying of the ark in holy wars still reflected the old custom, but after the ark was located permanently in Jerusalem it completely lost its original significance.

The Levite inquired the will of Yahwe through urim and thummim, recited curses and blessings for the covenantal community. As champions of Yahwism they violently opposed any alien cult, as the story of the golden bull has preserved. When they lost the function of carrying the ark in holy war because they were abandoned by the kings, they went into opposition against the official cult. They preserved the old covenantal traditions of holy war, taught the apodictic law, and proclaimed the limitation of the kingship as did the prophets. The king was supposed to be nothing more or less than an official of Yahwe, as he had been in the beginning.

The kingship in Israel was a comparatively late institution. After a short prelude of charismatic leaders and a charismatic king, Saul, the monarchy formed and established itself according to the pattern of the surrounding monarchies. In the beginning Yahwe had designated a man through the gift of his charisma. This pattern always was remembered in the north, where every once in a while Yahwe removed a faithless king by calling upon a man to exterminate the unfaithful king and his house. But even in the north we have the same tendency which had been realized in the south through the Davidic dynasty, formation of dynasties, thus to assure continuity in ruling. Omri imitated the Davidic kings when he built a capital for himself on his own private ground, so that just as Jerusalem

legally stood beside Judah, thus Samaria legally stood as a stronghold of the house of Omri beside Israel. But in the north the kings never succeeded with dynastic ambitions.

After David, through shrewd political maneuvers and great political ability, had gained power over Judah and Jerusalem and had made a covenant with the northern tribes, he established his throne forever on the strong cultic foundation of the Jerusalem royal ideology. A certain secularization - which always in history accompanies strong cultic institutions - took place in Israel. Holy wars were abandoned, and kings took the protection of their people into their own hands. Yahwe was limited to the realm which belonged to a deity, the holy places and cult. The charisma was institutionalized and Yahwe's immediacy was removed. The king became ebed, chosen, righteous, anointed, god, son, and priest. Yahwe was located on Mount Zion, a mountain abode like the one belonging to Baal and El.

Through the everlasting covenant between David and Yahwe the continuity of the Davidic dynasty was assured, and the king also became the mediator of Yahwe's grace. The king was the guarantor of salvation, of sure and everlasting salvation, since the promise of everlasting continuity had lifted the institution of the Davidic monarchy out of the changing mood of human history. The New Years and enthronement feast characterize best the enactment

of this assurance of salvation through the cult. The king represented the corporate whole, in fact he was this corporate whole. What was good for the king was good for the people; when the king was victorious, the people were victorious. As anointed (Messiah) the king was the representative of Yahwe among his people; he was Yahwe among his people. This explains the superior position of the Davidic king as compared to the uncertain position of the king in the north; it also explains the strong popular hope connected with the figure of the Messiah.

When, in the New Years and enthronement festival, the king went through ritual humiliation,even death, he did this as a representative of the corporate whole. He also was resurrected as a representative of the corporate whole. As rain follows drought and resurrection follows upon death, thus after the eschaton salvation surely comes. This cultic eschatology was the basis of the confidence of king and people in the south, a confidence which is especially exhibited in the representatives of the official cult in their struggle with the "great" prophets.

The struggle of the "great" prophets against officials and kingship may be summed up with the verse from Isaiah: "If you will not believe you shall not be established." The appearance of the prophets seems to be connected with the rise of the monarchy and the loss of status by the Levites. In the beginning we have unity: Samuel is seer

and priest. That means he united in himself both office and *charisma*. With the loss of the ark, other means of divination and symbols for the presence of Yahwe had to be found. The charismatic, the seer, soon is called prophet and communicates the *dabar* of Yahwe to the community. Even the prophetic *charisma* soon becomes institutionalized, when some charismatics like Samuel form groups of disciples in order to preserve the *charisma* for later generations.

Here lies the root of "false" prophets or *nebiim*. The *charisma* of course could not be preserved or channeled. Beside the *nebiim* guilds, individuals appear with the signs of a prophet: they speak the *dabar* of Yahwe and have mantic qualities, although they do not emphasize those mantic qualities in order to distinguish themselves from the guilds. The guilds furthered mantic qualities because they showed what a prophet acted like. The free prophets or "great" prophets were those who felt the hand of Yahwe and were compelled to go and proclaim the *dabar* which Yahwe had given them, and to preach without regard for their own person.

The *nabi* is the outspoken enemy of the official cult, which had an assurance of salvation where no salvation existed. The prophets were connected with the traditions of the past which were preserved by the Levites. A *nabi* proclaimed the need for the covenantal faithfulness of Israel and asserted the kingship of Yahwe. In the

above-mentioned verse from Isaiah, King Ahaz is faced with a decision which he fails to understand. Jerusalem's salvation is Yahwe, says the prophet, call upon him for a sign. The sign is holy war, which means Yahwe fighting for Jerusalem. Ahaz does not know this sign because he only knows that the cult cannot offer anything direct like this. Ahaz has no faith and that is his fate, as it is the fate of all Israel. Because they do not trust in Yahwe but in alliances and in the cult with its vain assurance of salvation, Yahwe will punish Israel and destroy Jerusalem.

The prophets point to the covenant of the exodus when Yahwe acted on behalf of his people. The relationship to Yahwe has no natural origin. Israel should not understand herself as autochthon in this country Yahwe had given her. Israel is a stranger among nations, although she acts as if she were at home here. She had settled and whored with the deities of the Canaanites. The kingship had established itself forever, or so the people thought. But is not the king an official of Yahwe, a functionary so to speak? The day of Yahwe will be a gruesome day and not a day of joy as they believed. The prophets tore the day of Yahwe out of its cultic context and put it into a historical context. Assyria and Babylonia had come to power one after the other, and this spelled destruction for Israel and Judah. The faithless people and the usurper king will be taken into exile. Isaiah proclaims Immanuel,

"God with us", as the king of Israel. The prophet refers here without any doubt to a charismatic king, one who is truly Yahwe among his people. A remnant will be left after the destruction. In the remnant judgment and salvation meet. Emmanuel is the king of the remnant. That means remnant and Messiah are closely connected; they seem to be one.

After the downfall of the north, Yahwist traditions came to the south, together with Levitical priests who had been the preservers of old covenantal traditions. The result of the merger of mainly northern and some southern traditions in Deuteronomy marks the attempt to pull what is left of Israel back into the old covenantal amphictyonic organism. However, Deuteronomy understood the covenant as bachar covenant. This shows how much the authors of Deuteronomy were aware of the need for the sole and saving action of Yahwe. The king was limited to being an official of Yahwe, just as the charismatic king had been an official of Yahwe.

When Deuteronomy had to make a positive statement about the relationship between Yahwe and Israel the bachar covenant was adopted from royal ideology. This was only possible because the old covenantal conditions were changed and Israel was at least partially released from its responsibility as a covenantal partner. This is just to say that everything depended on Yahwe. However, Deuteronomy

sharpened the duty of the people to withstand all idolatry. Deuteronomy really exhibits a martial spirit. The people of the country in which Israel lives shall be exterminated because they could lead the people astray to serve other gods than Yahwe.

According to Deuteronomy, the Levites were allowed to officiate at any sanctuary which Yahwe chose. This meant centralization in the way worship was centralized in the old times, when the ark moved from shrine to shrine. Where the ark was, there also was the central cult place. Josiah, however, interpreted Deuteronomy as it suited his political ambitions best. He arbitrarily assumed that centralization meant centralization at Jerusalem, but he was not willing to subject himself to the king's law in Deuteronomy where Deuteronomy, like Hosea, made the king almost superfluous. The only demand which Josiah fulfilled, and again with political ambitions involved, was the removal of all alien cult places from Israel. That he did, but he also removed all Yahwe sanctuaries and killed the priests there, so that there existed no possible competition for Jerusalem as "the sanctuary which Yahwe will choose". Deuteronomy never did fulfill its purpose, and Josiah's son certainly was not the man to do anything about the demands of Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy regulated prophetism. We discovered already the positive attitude which Deuteronomy had toward

the covenant and the need for salvation there. Now Deuteronomy tries to protect the people from the prophets. A true prophet is the one whose dabar is fulfilled. Deuteronomy wants the dabar and knows about the significance of it, but wants it in organized form. All forces of Israel shall be united in the effort to rebuild the national image. Negative attitudes or criticism were not wanted. Thus the true character of free revelation was defeated when Deuteronomy limited the spontaneous dabar. From time to time Yahwe would awake a prophet. This shows what is meant: continuity was desired even where the charisma was concerned; moreover, it was regulated continuity.

Deuteronomy was not able to restore Israel. A more drastic action by Yahwe was needed, something which really removed the pillars of all security. Jerusalem should be destroyed and the everlasting covenant with the house of David should be proved nothing. The people should even be deported from the land.

From the exile we hear the last prophetic voice. Deutero-Isaiah attempts a synthesis of all Israelite traditions: Levitical, prophetic, and royal. But this synthesis had a completely different emphasis compared to Deuteronomy's synthesis. No regulations for prophets and kings are found. The kingship was gone anyway, and Deutero-Isaiah was the last prophetic voice proclaiming the universal kingship of Yahwe in unknown dimensions. Deutero-Isaiah had nothing

to build upon in comparison to Deuteronomy, which at least had the southern monarchy left intact.

The only thing left in Deutero-Isaiah's time was the remnant which survived the purge. It is the purpose of the remnant in the world and among nations which Deutero-Isaiah unfolds. We find in Deutero-Isaiah the uncompromising Levitical attitude against all idols. The extreme prophetic proclamation of complete annihilation of Israel is abandoned. A remnant was left, as Isaiah had said there would be. The cultic assurance of salvation had been proven wrong. Did Yahwe leave Israel, or was he defeated together with Israel as many exiles apparently believed? Against the skepticism of the exiles, Deutero-Isaiah proclaims a new chance for Israel which is really Yahwe's only chance. A new creation, a new exodus will come. Here the old tradition of Yahwe 's action in history is adopted: creation is nothing mythological or cultic, it is the new exodus, the fact that Yahwe has chosen his people anew to show his might among the nations. New Years and enthronement hymnology is employed to proclaim the universal kingship of Yahwe.

We find in Deutero-Isaiah an unequalled assurance of salvation; however, no cultic action is demanded to bring this salvation about or create it in the minds of the worshippers. There is no separation of secular and holy here. Cult has no significance for Deutero-Isaiah.

Yahwe is king universal; nothing is exempt from his demand. He will prove his might among the nations by the means of his servant Israel. The smallness of Israel is the right contrast for the greatness of Yahwe, who will lead his people in a new exodus to Zion, where the symbol of the sovereignty of Yahwe will be erected. Although the servant Israel, that which is left, the holy remnant, is an eschatological reality, the servant also is a present figure in history. The end of time has begun, which means the day of Yahwe has begun, not in the cult, but on a universal scale. Until the kingship of Yahwe is professed among all nations the ebed, the remnant, will be a true servant of Yahwe, to witness and to be a symbol of the absolute kingship of Yahwe. Just as the king had been Yahwe in Israel, thus will the servant be Yahwe among the nations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alt, Albrecht. "Hosea 5:8-6:6," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, XXX (1919), 537-568.

Alt, Albrecht. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 2 vols. Munchen: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953.

Bauer, Hans. "Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LI (1933).

Baumgartner, Walter. "Ugaritische Probleme und ihre Tragweite für das Alten Testament," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 1947.

Beer, Georg. *Exodus*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1939.

Begrich, Joachim. "Das Priesterliche Heilsorakel," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LII (1934), 81-92.

Bentzen, Aage. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1957.

Bentzen, Aage. *King and Messiah*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.

Bertholet, Alfred. *Deuteronomium*. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1899.

Brooks, Beatrice A. "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LX (1941), 227-253.

Buber, Martin. *Königtum Gottes*. Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1936.

Buber, Martin. *The Prophetic Faith*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949.

Burrows, Millar. *What Mean These Stones?* New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

The Complete Bible, An American Translation. Edited by J.M.P. Smith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, revised, 1935.

Danell, F.A. Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeriaktiebolag, 1946.

Draffkorn, Anne E. "Ilani/Elohim," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1957), pp. 216ff.

Dumermuth, F. "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXX (1958), 59-78.

Eichrodt, Walter. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs'schen Buchhandlung, 1939.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah 40-55 in the Light of the Israelite Conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real," Expository Times, XLIV (1932-33), pp. 261ff.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "Ras Schamra," Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1939, pp. 406ff.

Eissfeldt, Otto. Sanchunjaton von Beirut und Ilumilku von Ugarit. Halle: 1952.

Engnell, Ivan. "The Ebed Yahwe Songs and the Suffering Messiah in "Deutero-Isaiah"," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXI (1948), 54-93.

Fichtner, J. "Jahwes Plan in der Botschaft des Jesaja," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXIII (1951), 16-33.

Galling, Kurt. Die Erwälungstraditionen Israels. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1928.

Gaster, Theodor H. Thespis. New York: Henry Schuman, 1950.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. Hebräisches und Aramaisches Handwörterbuch uber das Alte Testament. Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1949.

Gray, George Buchanan. The Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX. Vol. I. Vol. 20 of International Critical Commentary, ed. Charles Augustus Briggs. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

Gray, George Buchanan. *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Gressmann, Hugo. *Der Messias*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929.

Grether, Otto. *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1934.

Gunkel, Herman, and Zscharnack, Leopold. *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1928-30.

Gyllenberg, Rafael. *Interpretationes ad vetus Testamentum Pertinentes Sigmundo Mowinckel*. Oslo: Fabritius & Sønner, 1955.

Hänel, Johannes. *Das Erkennen Gottes bei den Schriftpropheten*. Berlin: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1923.

Häussermann, Friedrich. *Wortemfang und Symbol in der Alttestamentlichen Prophetie*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1932.

Hempel, Johannes. *Das Ethos des Alten Teataments*. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1938.

Hempel, Johannes. "Glaube, Mythos und Geschichte im Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXV (1953), 109-167.

Hempel, Johannes. *Gott und Mensch im Alten Testaments*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936.

Hentschke, Richard. *Die Stellung der vorexilischen Schriftpropheten.zum Kultus*. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *Die Samuelbücher*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

Hesse, F. "Wurzelt die prophetische Gerichtsrede im israelitischen Kult?" *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXV (1953), 45-53.

Hooke, S.H.(ed) *Myth and Ritual*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Hooke, S.H. *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual*. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Holzinger, H. *Numeri*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1903.

Jack, James William. *Ras Shamra Tablets, Their Bearing on the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1935.

Jenni, Ernst. *Die Politischen Voraussagen der Propheten.* Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1956.

Jenni, Ernst. *Das Wort 'olam im Alten Testament.* *ZAW*, LXV (1953), 1-35.

Jirku, Anton. *Altorientalischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament.* Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Dr. Werner Scholl, 1923.

Johansson, Nils. *Parakletoi*. Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1940.

Johnson, Aubrey R. *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1944.

Johnson, Aubrey R. *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.

Kittel, Rudolf. *Biblia Hebraica*. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.

Kittel, Rudolf. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* 4 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933-42.

Koch, Klaus. "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXVII (1955), 205-226.

Köhler, Ludwig. *Deuterojesaja*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1923.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951.

Lindblom, Johannes. "Die Ebed Jahwe-Orakel in der neuentdeckten Jesaja-handschrift," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXIII (1951).

Lindhagen, Curt. *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament.* Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950.

May, Herbert Gordon. "The Patriarchal Idea of God," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* LX (1941), 113-128.

Meek, Theophile James. *Hebrew Origins*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1917.

Möhlenbrink, K. "Die levitische Uberlieferung des Alten Testaments," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LII (1934).

Morgenstern, Julian. *The Ark the Ephod and the "Tent of Meeting"*. Cincinati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1945.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Der Knecht Jahwäs*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1921.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Psalmenstudien*. 5 vols. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1923.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Religion und Kultus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1953.

Neumann, Erich. *The Great Mother*. New York: Pantheon, 1955.

Nielsen, D. *Ras Schamra Mythologie und Biblische Theologie*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1936.

Nielsen, Eduard. *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation*. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1955.

North, Christopher R. *The Old Testament Interpretation of History*. London: Epworth Press, 1946.

Noth, Martin. *Das Buch Joshua*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1938.

Noth, Martin. *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. München: Christian Kaiser, 1957.

Noth, Martin. *Geschichte Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.

Noth, Martin. "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1950, 157-191.

Noth, Martin. *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemein-semitidchen Namengebung*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928.

Noth, Martin. *Das System des zwölf Stämme Israels*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.

Obermann, Julian. "The Divine Name YHWH in the Light of Recent Discoveries," *Journal of Biblical Literature* LXVIII (1949), pp. 301ff.

Östborn, Gunnar. *Tōrā in the Old Testament.* Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1945.

Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel, Its Life and Culture.* 4 vols. in 2. London: Oxford University Press, 1953-4.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Ploger, Otto. "Priester und Prophet," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXIII (1951), 157-192.

Pope, Marvin H. *El in the Ugaritic Texts.* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955.

Press, Richard. "Der Gottesknecht im Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXVII (1955), 67-98.

Pritchard, James. (Ed.) *Ancient Near Eastern Texts.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Pritchard, James. *Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature.* New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1943.

Rendtorff, Rolf. "Die theologische Stellung des Schöpfungsglaubens bei Deuterojesaja," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1954, 1-13.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. *The Cross in the Old Testament.* London: SCM Press Ltd., 1955.

Robinson, Theodore H. *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel.* London: Duckworth, 1948.

Robinson, Theodore H. and Horst, F. *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1938.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Jeremia.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1947.

Schmid, Herbert. "Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXVII (1955), 168-197.

Staerk, Walter. "Zum alttestamentlichen Erwahlungs glauben," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LV (1937), 1-36.

Simpson, Cuthbert A. *The Early Traditions of Israel.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948.

Skinner, John. *Prophecy and Religion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Thiele, Edwin R. *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Torrey, C. C. *The Second Isaiah.* New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1928.

van der Leeuw, G. *Phänomenologie der Religion.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1956.

Volz, Paul. *Jesaja II.* Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1932.

Volz, Paul. *Der Prophet Jeremia.* Leipzig: A. Diechertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1928.

von Rad, Gerhard. "Die falschen Propheten," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LI (1933) 109-120.

von Rad, Gerhard. *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel.* Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1951.

von Rad, Gerhard. *Studies in Deuteronomy.* Translated by David Stalker. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1953.

von Rad, Gerhard. *Theologie des Alten Testaments.* München: Christian Kaiser, 1957.

Vriezen, Theodore C. *Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament.* Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1953.

Welch, Adam C. *Jeremiah, His Time and His Work.* London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

Welch, Adam C. *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1953.

Weiser, Artur. *Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona, Micha.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.

Weiser, Artur. *Der Prophet Jeremia.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952.

Widengren, George. *Sakrales Königtum im Alte Testamente und im Judentum*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1955.

Wildberger, Hans. "Samuel und die Entstehung des israelitischen Königtums," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 1957, 442-469.

Würthwein, Ernst. "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede,' *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1952, 1-16.

Zimmerli, Walther, and Jeremias, Joachim. *The Servant of God*. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957.

GTU Library
3 2400 00537 6441

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.